

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

1137-1

HEARING
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
PROPOSALS TO AMEND OR OTHERWISE MODIFY EXISTING
INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS,
INCLUDING THE UNITED NATIONS

PART 11

APRIL 11, 1955
DENVER, COLO.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama	BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota	WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California
ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky	GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon	HOMER E. CAPEHART, Indiana

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL MARCY, *Consultant*
JULIUS N. CAHN, *Counsel*
PAT M. HOLT, *Consultant*
ALWYN V. FREEMAN, *Consultant*
C. C. O'DAY, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Created pursuant to Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, as amended by Senate Resolution 83, 84th Congress, and continued by Senate Resolution 193, 83d Congress, and Senate Resolution 36, 84th Congress

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida ¹	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota	WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL MARCY, *Consultant*
FRANCIS R. VALEO, *Consultant* ²
MORELLA HANSEN, *Research Assistant*
MARY ANN SAMES, *Assistant Clerk*

¹ Appointed by the Vice President to serve with the subcommittee.

² To be appointed by the Vice President to serve with the subcommittee.

³ On loan from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

CONTENTS

Statements by—	Page
Awner, Max, Colorado State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L.	1462
Becker, Edgar N., John S. Stewart Post No. 1, Colorado, Veterans of Foreign Wars	1478
Bishop, Dr. Neal D., Denver	1597
Boyer, Ralph, Society of Friends	1508
Brannan, Hon. Charles F., general counsel, National Farmers Union ..	1548
Brinker, Mrs. Waller C., Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution	1559
Bulkeley, Max M., Denver	1510
Dixon, Mrs. Robert M., president, League of Women Voters of Colorado	1567
Dunklee, Edward V., president, United Nations Committee for Colorado	1536
Ehrlich, Mrs. Carol, public affairs committee, Unitarian Church, Denver	1539
Feingold, Mrs. S. Rhita, Denver	1519
Fox, Guy, board of social and economic relations, Colorado Conference of the Methodist Church	1602
Franklin, Cecil, Denver Fellowship of Reconciliation	1494
Frieder, Philip, Young Democrats of Denver	1606
Goff, Kenneth, director, Soldiers of the Cross, Englewood	1590
Harper, Florence S., delegate, Denver Federation of Teachers, Local No. 858, and Colorado Federation of Teachers	1467
Higman, Dr. Howard, Boulder	1574
Hoiles, Harry H., Colorado Springs	1572
Hollis, Rev. Harvey, Denver Council of Churches	1448
King, Dr. Edward C., Boulder	1588
LeFevre, Robert, Congress of Freedom, Inc.	1579
Lucas, Robert W., Denver	1450
Marler, Donald F., Denver	1512
Marshall, Rev. William J., Rawlins, Wyo.	1524
Miller, Mrs. Lynn H., president, Colorado division, American Association of University Women	1452
Miller, Victor A., Fighting Home Folks of Fighting Men, Glenwood Springs	1516
Milstein, Mrs. Sidney, vice president, National Council of Jewish Women, Denver section	1585
Moody, Walter, Denver	1521
Moore, Gordon, International Relations Club, South High School, Denver	1596
Nelson, Dr. Alfred C., dean, Community College, University of Denver	1604
Nelson, John O., the United Nations Study Group of Boulder, Boulder ..	1600
Newstrom, Paul M., chairman, Americanism committee, National Sojourners, Inc., State of Colorado	1532
Owen, R. Bryan, chairman, United Nations committee, Denver chapter, Americans for Democratic Action	1456
Parson, Elmer S., Americanism chairman, Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post No. 1, the American Legion, Denver	1595
Pate, David, Denver	1543
Pemberton, Mrs. Mary J., Colorado coordinator, Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment	1454
Perkin, Robert L., member, executive board, Denver Newspaper Guild, Local No. 74, American Newspaper Guild, CIO	1482

Statements by—Continued	Page
Pieper, Fred C., regional director, CIO region 12, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and Utah	1525
Pond, Mrs. Abbott S., Wyoming, State chairman, "For America;" United States Flag Committee; and We, the People	1484
Purdy, LaRoy H., director, district 8, Communications Workers of America, CIO	1470
Roberts, Dr. Walter Orr, Boulder	1514
Ruhtenberg, Mrs. A. G. Jan, Colorado coordinator, Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment	1459
Toll, David, chairman, international relations committee, Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce	1569
Wallace, Howard L., Students for Democratic Action, University of Denver	1583
Warren, George, Denver	1498
Whittemore, Rev. Edward, Colorado Council of Churches	1520
Wilkinson, Mrs. Lacy, legislative chairman, Greeley Federated Women's Clubs; legislative chairman for Colorado State Council of Churches, Department of Women	1492
Williams, Edwin A., president, the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution	1469
Williams, Wayne, chairman, Denver chapter, United World Federalists, Inc.	1562
Statements, etc., submitted for the record by—	
Mrs. Rolland W. Hoops, president for the Steele Center UNESCO Group	1499
Edward J. Anderson, Golden	1500
Dolores Kiser, president, Colorado State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.	1502
Carl S. Homsher, Denver	1501
Mrs. Wilma Nissley, president, Denver branch, Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom	1503
Oscar P. Noble, Glade Park	1504
J. H. P. Fisk, Walsenburg	1505
Opal M. Ragan, Colorado Springs	1505
Hilda B. Parmater and Harry A. Parmater	1506
N. G. Vansickle, Las Vegas, N. Mex.	1507
William P. Sugars, Denver	1507
Elizabeth Gatewood Pietsch, Denver	1607
W. V. Kennett, Elizabeth	1608
Miss Lois R. Eagan, Denver	1609
Mrs. Franklyn Brown, Colorado Springs	1611
Hon. Byron L. Johnson, State representative from Arapahoe County	1612

NOTE.—Unless otherwise noted, all cities are in Colorado.

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1955

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER,
Denver, Colo.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2 p. m., in Phipps Auditorium, Senator John J. Sparkman presiding.

Present: Senators Sparkman, Mansfield, and Knowland.

Also present: Representative Byron G. Rogers and Hon. Quigg Newton, mayor of Denver.

Mr. GOOD. The audience will rise and give the pledge of allegiance to the flag, after which the invocation will be delivered by Rev. Dean Paul Roberts.

(The audience rose and gave the pledge of allegiance to the flag.)

Dr. ROBERTS. Let us pray.

Mr. TOLL. Ladies and gentlemen, we are very fortunate in having the subcommittee come to Denver, and I would like to tell each of you that this committee has come to Denver at the special invitation and request of Mayor Quigg Newton.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce at this point the mayor of the city of Denver, Quigg Newton.

WELCOMING STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR

Mayor NEWTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Toll, and ladies and gentlemen.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the Subcommittee on the United Nations of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States for accepting the invitation that I extended to it on behalf of the people of Denver to use Denver as one of the sites for a hearing on the revision of the United Nations Charter.

Denver has been selected as one of 10 cities throughout the whole United States as a site for one of these hearings, and I think the selection of Denver is a tribute to the people of Denver and the interest that they have shown over these many years in foreign relations problems, and I feel that the committee's plans and efforts will be rewarded by the testimony that will be heard here today by Denver citizens.

Thank you all for your participation.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR SPARKMAN

Senator SPARKMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, about 10 years ago, 51 nations including our own signed the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco. Senator Knowland and I have just come from

there. On Saturday last we held a hearing of the Senate subcommittee pertaining to the revision of the United Nations Charter in that city. It was a most informative and useful session.

We heard a wide assortment of views on what was right with the U. N. and what was wrong with it and what ought to be done about it. I learned that Californians have some very emphatic ideas on the subject. And I suspect that those of the citizens of Colorado are no less emphatic. We are here today to listen to them.

PURPOSE OF HEARINGS

Before we begin I should like to make the purpose of these hearings clear.

There is a good possibility that an international conference to review the Charter of the United Nations will be held next year or shortly thereafter. The reason is to be found in the charter itself. It provides in effect that if a sufficient number of member States desire a general review conference, the General Assembly can call one for sometime after 1955. There are many indications that such a conference will be called.

By the way, let me say a good many people have the understanding that such conference is automatic under the charter. That is not correct. The charter provides that there shall automatically go on the agenda of the 10th General Assembly the question as to whether or not such conference shall be called. But the question as to whether or not that conference should be called is for the General Assembly to decide for itself.

We are out, therefore, to ask the people this question: Do you believe that there ought to be such a conference for the review of the charter? If you do, or if there is such a conference then what ideas, what suggestions, do you have as to how the charter ought to be reviewed?

It seems only commonsense that we be prepared. The Senate, in the exercise of its constitutional function to advise and consent to major foreign policy measures has a most important part to play in any review of the charter. If the Senate is to play that part wisely and effectively, it requires factual information, views, and ideas.

That is why the Senate set up this subcommittee—to study the subject of the U. N. and the many proposals which people are making with respect to the organization. That, in turn, is why this subcommittee is holding these hearings in various cities throughout the country. The hearings are an attempt to bring to bear on the problems which confront us, the intelligence and understanding of interested Americans. The witnesses who will appear before us today have given freely of their time and efforts to prepare themselves for this hearing. Regardless of their viewpoints, they are performing a valuable and useful public service and I want them to know that the subcommittee is deeply appreciative.

Now, I should like to present to you the other members of the subcommittee that are with me today.

By the way, the chairman of this special subcommittee under the resolution setting it up is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator George, of Georgia. Senator George expresses his regret that he is unable to be here with you people of Denver. He has asked me to preside in his absence.

I am delighted to have with me on this occasion the senior Senator from California, Senator Knowland.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. And on my right we have the junior Senator from Montana, Senator Mansfield. Both are members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

We are delighted to have at the table with us today your able Congressman, Congressman Rogers. We are delighted that Mayor Newton will stay with us, certainly for such time as he may. It is good to have all of you here.

Senator Knowland, do you have anything to add to what I have said or any statement you would like to make before we get started?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KNOWLAND

Senator KNOWLAND. Senator Sparkman, Senator George, the very able and outstanding Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the other members, have clearly recognized that in this geographically very vast country of ours, it was not possible for our citizens, who might have views that they cared to present, to all come to the Nation's Capital at Washington. Therefore, in order to bring the operations of this committee closer to the people of the Nation, it was decided to go out into some 10 selected cities, as well as hold hearings in Washington, in order to get a cross section of views. Certainly those of us who had an opportunity to participate in any of the meetings before felt that the views have been helpful. We have carried them on without acrimony, and there has been a general recognition that Americans may honestly differ and at the same time not have to question the motives of those who hold different ideas.

It is in this spirit and under the rules of the Senate that we have attempted to conduct these meetings, and I know that they will be conducted that way here in Denver.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Senator Knowland.

Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have no comment at this time, Mr. Chairman.

PROCEDURES FOR HEARING

Senator SPARKMAN. Now, just 1 minute for the rules of the game.

This is a completely nonpartisan, I shall say, hearing. As a matter of fact, unless you people know already, you just will not be told what party we belong to.

We are delighted to have all of you with us. We have quite a string of witnesses. We have only the 1 day to spend here, the hearing this afternoon and the hearing for tonight. We are due back in Washington in the morning, and therefore time is limited.

Every person that has been allotted time—and my understanding is that everyone who requested time was allotted it, up until it was felt that we simply could not take any more—has been informed, I understand, that the time limitation for the presentation of his or her statement will be 5 minutes. Now, it may be that you will not be able to present your entire statement within the 5 minutes. Regardless of that, the full statement will be carried in our hearings.

So if any of you would like to summarize your statement in your own words, you may feel perfectly free to do so, or handle it as you see fit.

The young lady sitting at the desk will be the timekeeper. At the end of 4 minutes, she will notify the witness that he or she has 1 minute left, and at the end of 5 minutes, she will give notice that time is up, and it will be expected that that will be taken literally.

However, do not leave the seat immediately. Just quit talking, because I will give both Senator Knowland and Senator Mansfield a chance to ask questions.

It may be that a question will be desired, or it may be that no questioning will be desired. But at least give us that opportunity.

Now, may I suggest that since the witness has to come to the platform, that when a witness is called, the next witness in order will be announced, and I would suggest that the next witness come up in order that there may be as little time lost as possible in changing witnesses.

Now, one other thing. You know people in public life always like to be applauded, and they like to hear applause. But we are trying to conserve time today, and as Senator Knowland has suggested, we are operating under the rules of the Senate. Those rules say that visitors shall not at any time show signs of approval or disapproval of what may be said.

If you will observe this, we shall certainly appreciate it, and it will mean the saving of much time.

Will you call the first witness?

Mr. GOOD. The first witness is Rev. Harvey Hollis. The second witness is Mr. Robert Lucas.

Senator SPARKMAN. Reverend Hollis, we are glad to have you, sir. Just proceed in your own way.

Dr. HOLLIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF REV. HARVEY HOLLIS, DENVER COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Dr. HOLLIS. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here to read a statement that came out of a series of studies and conferences on a representative basis of the several churches in Denver, comprising a constituency of better than 100,000 people. The statement follows:

AFFIRMATION OF SUPPORT FOR CHARTER

We affirm our continuing support of the United Nations. We accept the principles and purposes of the U. N.—that peace under justice and law, that friendly relations and mutual cooperation shall prevail among all men—as an expression of our highest aspiration and an imperative placed upon us by our Christian faith. We accept the United Nations and our participation in it as one of the symbols of our inextricable involvement in the world beyond our borders. We accept the United Nations as one of the instruments through which the enormous power of our country may be related constructively to the needs of all men, for we acknowledge that “unto whom much is given shall much be required.” Further, we believe that the aims of our foreign policy are not exhausted by the creation of military strength, as necessary as such strength assuredly is. We assert in

fact that the very basis of our power will depend ultimately upon the development of and expanding community of interests and of mutual trust with the other members of the free world. We accept the United Nations as an invaluable means to that end. Moreover, convinced that no man nor Nation is sufficiently good to exercise unquestioned control over his neighbor, we accept the United Nations as a necessary and healthy restraint upon the oftentimes preponderant power of our Nation.

OPPORTUNITY FOR CHARTER REVISION

We accept the proposed charter review conference as a welcome opportunity. The process of review is an opportunity to create new awareness of a new appreciation for the much good which the United Nations is doing and can do now. It is an opportunity to explore means for expanding its range of service to the cause of peace. At the same time, we believe that it is also necessary to be aware of certain dangers inherent in a review conference. We warn against the danger of expecting more than present political realities will allow, thus incurring disillusionment. We warn against the danger of measuring the success of a review conference by the extent to which it represents a victory of American policies. We are aware that within the present framework of the charter there has already taken place and will continue to take place a constructive "revision by interpretation." Therefore we warn that attempts at substantial revision of the charter must not be allowed to unsettle and retard this beneficial, organic growth.

We do not feel competent to speak to the many technicalities of charter revision. We do however, find merit in the principles endorsed by the Vandenberg resolution (S. Res. 239, 1948) that responsibility for the admission of new members be given to the General Assembly, thus eliminating the veto on this question, and further, that the veto no longer apply to the peaceful settlement of disputes under chapter 6 of the charter. Though urging consideration of these modifications, we recognize the present necessity of the principle of the veto.

Our responsibility as Christians is informed on the one hand by our understanding and affirmation of God's ultimate will for His world—a world at peace where justice for all men shall prevail. But our Christian responsibility is also informed by an acknowledgment of present political realities. We understand that if our efforts are to be effective, we must seek to work constructively within the limits of the possible. We support therefore all efforts made in good faith to strengthen the United Nations organization. But we recognize at the same time that these efforts may not be entirely successful. For this reason, we believe it to be of the greatest importance to realize that the United Nations, as presently constituted, itself represents a unique and valuable contribution to the cause of peace and deserves our continuing support. It is a minimal bridge between the Soviet and non-Soviet worlds. It is a forum for the debate of issues which continue to divide men, and a rallying point for cooperation concerning issues upon which there is unity. It is an agency dedicated to pioneering the development of means for the mutual solution of mutual problems. We warmly endorse the ongoing activities of the World Health Organization, the Children's

Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, and the many other specialized agencies associated with the United Nations. We urge the expansion of these programs, and especially the work of technical assistance under the United Nations. We enthusiastically support the ongoing efforts through the United Nations to achieve an enforceable system of disarmament with universal inspection.

In conclusion, we affirm our responsibility to seek a strengthened U. N., if possible through charter revision. Yet we affirm equally our continuing obligation to take advantage of the numerous opportunities, presently available under the United Nations, to discharge our responsibilities in an interdependent world.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Any questions, Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Dr. HOLLIS. Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. The next witness.

Mr. GOOD. The next witness is Mr. Robert Lucas, and the third witness is Mrs. Lynn H. Miller.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Lucas, please have a seat, sir, and proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. LUCAS, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. LUCAS. My name is Robert W. Lucas. I am editor of the editorial page of the Denver Post, and I make this statement in behalf of myself.

DANGERS OF CHARTER REVISION

First, may I say quite candidly that I am not well enough informed about the internal point and counterpoint of the United Nations to speak with authority upon details of the charter's amendment. They present problems, which only those closest to the facts can best answer. I would suggest only that change of the charter, if not reasoned and truly remedial in character, could do more harm than good. And I would suggest further that the U. N. is in what might be called double jeopardy today; it is in danger of its friends as well as its enemies. For the friends of the United Nations, in their supreme eagerness for its success, could be unwittingly trying to endow it with responsibilities and powers for which it was never conceived. That, it would seem to me, should be a warning to any and all insisting upon charter revision.

I propose here, for example, no changes in the existing procedures for the admission of new members to the United Nations, or in the criteria for accepting or rejecting the credentials of present members. My plea with respect to membership in general is for the greatest number possible, with liberal standards of eligibility—consistent with the effectiveness and dignity of the organization.

To illustrate again, I believe change in the veto power must await broader acceptance, in practice as well as in theory, of the United Nations philosophical objectives by all members. We must endure abuses of what appear to be arbitrary misuse of the dissenting author-

ity in the Security Council and await the ripening of world public opinion in opposition to obstructive conduct of the U. N. Patience may achieve what impulsive reaction will surely not achieve.

My purpose in this brief statement is only to add one more voice to the chorus of hope and encouragement that the United Nations may become a permanent forum and some day a formidable force to keep world peace. No informed person today may deny the interdependence of peoples and countries. No nation can rationalize isolation, or a return to complete reliance upon the raw power as the only arbiter of international disagreements. To deny the efficacy and necessity of collective world security as of the mid-twentieth century would be an invitation to disaster.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE U. N.

Now, it seems to me the people of all nations, east and west, north and south, comprehend the mounting dilemma of survival more fully today than they did at the time the U. N. Charter was born. And the United Nations itself has contributed enormously to the comprehension of the problems facing mankind, if not to their solutions. No problem can be answered until and unless it is well understood. And who can say that the U. N., even while troubled by its own operational weaknesses, has not added to the essential knowledge of man and the changing environment that is engulfing him?

The degree of respect and gratitude for the United Nations may indeed be stronger in distant, underdeveloped countries where the 17 technical and humanitarian agencies are doing their magnificent work than in the United States where the people are preoccupied with the political decisions of the Security Council. This is a sad though accurate reflection of the economic imbalance in the world—an imbalance which the U. N.—through its good services—may help correct. But if the United Nations is to succeed in that and related missions, interest in it and endorsement of its fundamental ideas must be as universal among the people of its most highly developed member nation as among others less fortunate. So there is a peculiar obligation to, in my opinion, intensify the American people's appreciation of the U. N. corollary agencies in the field.

CHANGE THROUGH GROWTH AND PRACTICE

The basic law or charter of the United Nations was conceived before the advent of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Their introduction to the grim scheme of warfare obviously imposes added and more urgent burdens upon those seeking after some workable formula for world order. The continued research into means of human and material obliteration is successful, unfortunately, tragically, in inverse ratio to the mortality chances of millions and millions of people. Unless, that is, the United Nations—the organization or the idea—becomes a permanent part of human thought and striving.

It seems unlikely to me that the United Nations Charter as presently written is the last, best word. I believe we shall have to go much further in the direction of consolidated military effort, and cooperative political activity in the field of law, economics, health, and education than is possible under the charter as it presently stands.

But we must be realistic, too, about picking our time to propose radical changes when and as long as the world is split by the gulf that separates the totalitarian philosophy of the Soviet Union from the non-Soviet world.

Finally, it will be recalled that Secretary Dulles himself has said that "charter review" should be approached with recognition that "the charter as it is can be made to serve well the cause of international peace and justice." He said further that the "defects in the charter can to considerable extent be corrected by practices which are permissible under it."

That returns me to my original point, namely, that the base of public comprehension and endorsement of the ideal of collective security and international justice must be worldwide before any mechanical effort to assure either or both will succeed.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, indeed, Senator Mansfield.

Senator MANSFIELD. I did not quite finish reading your statement, Mr. Lucas, but am I to understand that as of now you would not favor any revision in the U. N. Charter?

Mr. LUCAS. That is my belief.

Senator MANSFIELD. And that we ought to be more careful, take our time and be sure of what we are doing?

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Would you favor a conference?

Mr. LUCAS. I think so; yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. In other words, you would be in favor of a conference to discuss it, although you would go slow toward making any revisions?

Mr. LUCAS. I believe that a conference for the discussion of revisions in the charter would be very helpful. It would bring out the weaknesses; it would also, it seems to me, give an opportunity to illustrate and to emphasize the changes that have come about since the United Nations was formed, largely through the resolution of 1950, transmitting to the General Assembly much of the authority previously held, as I understand it, almost exclusively, by the Security Council.

In other words, it would be good public education.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Lucas.

Mrs. Miller.

Mr. GOOD. The fourth witness will be Mrs. Mary J. Pemberton.

Senator SPARKMAN. All right, Mrs. Miller, we are glad to have you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LYNN H. MILLER, PRESIDENT, COLORADO DIVISION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, Senator Knowland, at its biennial convention in June of 1953, the American Association of University Women reaffirmed its faith in the United Nations as the best hope of the world for preserving the peace. The legislative program approved by the convention included:

Support of measures for effective participation in and strengthening of the United Nations and its affiliated agencies—

and—

Support of a constructive foreign policy which would endeavor to develop conditions favorable to democracy and economic well-being throughout the world as prerequisites for national and international peace and security.

The board of directors of Colorado division of the AAUW has urged its branches throughout the State to study the Charter of the United Nations in preparation for better understanding of the problems facing delegates to a review conference which it is anticipated will be held in 1956.

Now is the time to take stock, to consider what the purposes of this organization (the United Nations) are, fundamentally, in what ways and to what extent it has been fulfilling these purposes. What about the charter? Has it proved to be so rigid an instrument that it is already archaic and needs tremendous overhauling, or has it been flexible? Has the United Nations grown within the framework which is provided for it in the first instance?

Dr. Meribeth E. Cameron, chairman of the AAUW international relations committee, said at a conference of State presidents in Washington, D. C., last June. Colorado division believes that while the United Nations by force of circumstances has not been able to fulfill entirely its primary purpose of keeping the peace and preventing war, it has nevertheless through its affiliated agencies been able to alleviate suffering and misery and raise the general standard of living throughout the world.

FLEXIBLE INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARTER

We believe the interpretation of the charter is capable of flexibility as was demonstrated in the case of the General Assembly's passage of the Uniting for Peace resolution.

We believe the United Nations has grown within the framework of the present charter, but that its further growth would be stimulated by the abolishment of the veto power for admission of new members and for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In other words, we endorse the principle of the Vandenberg resolution.

We believe the United Nations is indispensable as a forum of world opinion and look forward to the ultimate goal of universal membership.

We commend the splendid work which many of the affiliated agencies of the United Nations have done; but we feel these agencies should be tied more closely to the United Nations Organization.

Thus, we would look with favor on the introduction of comparatively minor revision; but we think, as Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, has indicated, that defects in the charter can, to a considerable extent, be corrected by new practices and interpretations which are permissible under the charter. We would not risk jeopardizing the good already achieved, unsettling the organic growth that has taken place, undermining existing cooperation by a split among nations of the free world, or arousing false hopes or fears throughout the world as to what can be achieved.

Article 109 of the charter provides that the proposal to call a review conference shall be placed on the agenda of the 10th General Assembly if such a conference has not been held before that time. We call

attention to the fact that such a conference will be for purposes of review—not necessarily revision—and feel proposals which would disrupt the United Nations will be ill-advised. To quote Mr. Dulles again:

The United Nations as it is, is better than no United Nations at all.

As an afterthought, we wish to commend the State Department for wishing to have a sampling of public opinion on charter review and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for holding open hearings on the subject. This technique should succeed not only in getting a cross section of “grassroots” opinion but should also tend to serve as mass education by increasing interest in the United Nations and stimulating study of the organization and its charter.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Miller.

Next witness, Mrs. Pemberton.

Mr. GOOD. The next witness after Mrs. Pemberton will be Mr. R. Bryan Owen.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mrs. Pemberton.

Mrs. PEMBERTON. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY J. PEMBERTON, COLORADO COORDINATOR, VIGILANT WOMEN FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mrs. PEMBERTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Mary J. Pemberton, of Denver, Colo. Housewife.

I present the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment. Mrs. A. G. Jan Ruhtenberg, of Colorado Springs, and I serve as Colorado coordinators of the Vigilant Women.

The Vigilant Women is not a membership-type of organization. We are financed by small donations from supporters of the Bricker amendment. Our national coordinators are Mrs. Winifred Barker, of Chicago, and Mrs. Ruth Murray, of Oshkosh, Wis. They work through coordinators and other interested individuals and organizations in all the 48 States.

Our organization is unique in that its full time and attention is devoted to the Bricker amendment and related issues. One such related issue is the question of the U. N. Charter revision. We believe that the charter should be revised so that no provision thereof will be in conflict with our Constitution after adoption of the Bricker amendment.

I have examined the staff studies and record of hearings of this subcommittee. To the best of my knowledge, so far no organization has offered for your consideration any detailed plans for charter revision. I have the honor today, on behalf of the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment, to submit a detailed plan of U. N. Charter revision with specific amendments to specific articles of the charter. This plan is being made public today for the first time.

REVISIONS PROPOSED TO LIMIT U. N.

We call our plan The American Plan for U. N. Charter Revision. If that sounds presumptuous, we can only say that the plan has been

thoroughly considered, carefully drafted, and inspired by the honest conviction that its acceptance would—

1. Promote international good will by stopping the U. N. meddling in domestic affairs.

2. Promote international peace and security by encouraging the U. N. to concentrate its energies on problems of genuine international concern;

3. Maximize America's freedom of action on which depends the safety of the non-Communist world and the hope of oppressed peoples for deliverance from Communist tyranny; and

4. Reduce the danger of international agreements being used to undermine the God-given, inalienable rights of the individual.

A copy of this American Plan for U. N. Charter Revision will be sent to all Members of the United States Senate. Copies will be distributed through organizations which believe, as we do, that international cooperation need not result in the loss of individual liberty or national sovereignty. Our national coordinators hope to place copies of this American Plan for U. N. Charter Revision in thousands of schools and colleges. I respectfully request that our plan be printed in the record of this hearing.

On numerous occasions, Senator Bricker has explained that nothing in his amendment is inconsistent with the original intent and purpose of the United Nations Charter. Unfortunately, as many high officials proudly boast, the U. N. Charter today is not the charter that was approved by the Senate in 1945. The charter has been distorted by fanciful interpretation. The solemn assurances made to the Senate and to the American people in 1945 have been repudiated. In general, our proposed charter amendments merely restate safeguards that were originally intended to protect national sovereignty and individual rights against U. N. encroachment.

CHALLENGE OF CHARTER REVISION

The impending Charter Review Conference challenges the President, the Senate, and the American people to take an unequivocal stand on the proper relationship between the United States and the U. N. That challenge cannot be met by weasel words. The Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment have accepted the challenge by proposing specific amendments to particular articles of the U. N. Charter. Let others do the same. And let the American people decide. We know that the ultra-internationalists are reluctant to spell out in black and white their revolutionary proposals. They fear, and with good reason, the reaction of patriotic Americans.

Many U. N. enthusiasts believe that the U. N. Charter is not an ordinary treaty but a world constitution. In the hearings of this subcommittee many witnesses have advocated long steps to world government by treaty or by some less formal arrangement. By endorsing the recommendations contained in the American Plan for U. N. Charter Revision the United States would announce to the world that only the American people, acting through their elected Federal and State representatives, have the power to alter our form of government.

Mrs. Ruhtenberg will summarize in her statement the major charter amendments recommended by the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment.

Senator SPARKMAN. I should like to remind you of the request we made in the beginning, that you withhold all demonstration of approval or disapproval. I ask you to do that regardless of what your feelings may be.

Thank you.

Any questions, Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. PEMBERTON. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Owen.

Mr. GOOD. The next witness after Mr. Owen will be Mrs. A. G. Jan Ruhtenberg.

STATEMENT OF R. BRYAN OWEN, CHAIRMAN, UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE, DENVER CHAPTER, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. OWEN. The Denver chapter of Americans for Democratic Action is not prepared at this time to take a stand on the question of whether or not the charter of the United Nations should be revised. There is some indication that due to the uneasiness existing between the major opposing political philosophies and even among the nations with which our country finds itself most often in agreement, a move to revise the U. N. Charter at this time might create a condition which would permit forces opposed to our participation in the U. N. to bring about the weakening of the charter. This result would, in our opinion, be extremely unfortunate.

We feel that any revision should work toward strengthening the entire U. N. and certainly those powers which have to do with the maintaining of world peace. We are so concerned with the vital importance of making the world organization a strong and effective instrument for the maintenance of order that we feel that the decision as to what stand our Government should take concerning charter revision should be made by the elected representatives of the people both in the legislative and executive branches.

PROPOSALS IF REVISION FOUND POSSIBLE

However, should our Government decide that it is possible to advocate the revision of the U. N. Charter at this time without risking weakening or reducing the power of the United Nations, we submit the following proposed revisions.

1. The United Nations should be provided with its own military establishment. This organization would be made up of volunteers from all member nations. The volunteers would be recruited on a percentage basis so designed that no nation would be allowed to contribute more than 5 percent of the total force. All volunteers would be expected, but not required, to make a career of this work. The international police force should be sufficient in number and its units adequately distributed to make it possible for action to be taken in any part of the world where a positive threat of a breach of peace is deemed by the U. N. to exist. This force would be commanded by a staff or

board answerable only to the U. N. and should be able to function at once where a clear-cut threat to peace exists despite any objection which may be voiced by any member nation. It should be armed, uniformed, and paid by the U. N.

2. Once the international police force is established, world disarmament should be undertaken. The member nations should be allowed only sufficient quantities of nonatomic weapons as are required for internal policing. These amounts would be established by an impartial commission composed entirely of so-called smaller powers. After the standards for the size of the internal military organizations have been agreed upon, the excess supplies should become the property of the U. N. international police force. Then a commission made up also from the so-called smaller powers should make regular inspections of the military establishments of all nations and report all findings to the U. N. The member nations must afford free access to all factories and plants within their borders, whether or not their paramount production is of a military nature, so that the commission could determine whether or not amounts of war potential products are being produced in excess of the nations' normal consumption and normal export.

3. The United States should support the principle of universal membership in the U. N. of all States which undertake to abide by charter obligations.

U. N. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPPORTED

4. The expanded technical-assistance program of the United Nations points the way to an eventually far-reaching and significant development program which this chapter of Americans for Democratic Action would support wholeheartedly.

An appropriation of \$8 million is under consideration in the Senate just now, for the U. N. technical-assistance program. In the light of today's needs and even by comparison with the bilateral technical-assistance contribution of the United States, the total of funds available under the U. N. program is a pitifully small amount.

But it is a beginning. It signals the recognition of the need for truly international cooperation. Some 75 nations have contributed to the program and it is having effect in more than 80 countries. It benefits the recipient countries; but it also serves to strengthen the U. N. as an instrument of international collaboration and security; it therefore is of enormous benefit to the contributing nations.

We recommend that this good beginning be followed as soon as possible by the establishment of international machinery to extend the benefits of the power age to any and all parts of the world which are deemed by the U. N. Technical Assistance Board to be ready for full development.

In the course of the next few years, international technical assistance should be so enriched that it could provide capital, equipment, and management technique enough to raise the standard of living of any underdeveloped country to very near the standard of a "modern western nation" in a few short years.

The cost of this type of program will be many times that of the present "expanded" technical-assistance program. It will run into billions of dollars rather than millions. But the cost to the contrib-

uting nations—especially the United States—will be trifling compared to the cost of an all-consuming third world war.

It is late, but not too late, to take these steps to prevent that war. Only by providing the means whereby the undeveloped nations of Asia and Africa can withstand the encroachment of communism can the U. N. hope to avoid the final conflict.

We do not pretend to suggest the exact machinery which should be set up within the U. N. to manage these larger programs. Perhaps it should consist of separate area boards or corporations within the framework of the present board. Certainly there should be participation by the recipient countries in the management of this program.

However it is to be administered, a start should be made now to accomplish this world development program, so that the underprivileged peoples of the world may know that they and their descendants have something to look forward to besides hunger, squalor, and toil, and that it may be obtained by democratic means rather than by totalitarian imposition.

OTHER PROPOSALS

5. The United States should support the principle of U. N. conventions. We urge the Senate to ratify the long-pending convention on genocide, and the State Department to submit to the Senate the U. N. convention on the political rights of women.

6. We deplore the failure of the United States to support in the U. N. the claims of colonial and dependent peoples for the implementation of the charter principles of self-government and self-determination. The arguments of noninterference in the domestic affairs of the colonial powers or of strategic interests should not prevail over America's declared commitment to the principles of national independence.

7. The United States should persist in efforts in and out of the U. N. to reach a settlement by peace treaties of the conflict between the Arab States and Israel, together with a solution of the tragic lot of the Arab refugees. The possibility of a Jordan River Valley Authority as a means toward a solution of some of these problems should be explored.

8. The United States as the headquarters of the U. N. should be open to all foreigners having business with it. We urge the abandonment of the present restrictions upon the admission and stay of foreigners, unnecessary for national security, and contrary to the policies of other countries which are host to U. N. agencies.

9. We deplore the pressures on the U. N. and its agencies to impose United States loyalty standards on international civil servants, in clear violation of the charter obligation of all member states to respect the independence of the international civil service. Checks of employees should be made only on request of the Secretary General or the heads of specialized agencies.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

U. N. PASSPORT QUESTION RAISED

Senator KNOWLAND. I would just like to ask one question on paragraph 8 in your written statement, that—

The United States as the headquarters of the United Nations should be open to all foreigners having business with it. We urge the abandonment of the present restrictions upon the admission and stay of foreigners, unnecessary for national security, and contrary to the policies of other countries which are host to U. N. agencies.

I would like to inquire whether your suggestion goes so far as to suggest that the United Nations should issue a form of international passport that would give them jurisdiction over the admission of such people.

Mr. OWEN. I had not considered that possibility. Senator, but it seems to me that within the duties required by these people in connection with the United Nations work, such a system might be very beneficial.

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, the U. N. headquarters being in the heart of the largest metropolitan district in the country, it would be a little difficult for them to control the dispersal of these people in other sections of either New York City or the country, if that were so. I just wanted to know if you had given any specific attention to how you would achieve our objective without opening the doors pretty wide.

Mr. OWEN. I grant you that it is a difficult problem. But I think that there are many difficult problems involved in this, and we should attempt to answer them as best we can.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. OWEN. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Ruhtenberg.

Mr. GOOD. After Mrs. Ruhtenberg, the next witness will be Mr. Max Awner.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Ruhtenberg, we are very glad to have you. Proceed in your own way.

Mrs. RUHTENBERG. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. A. G. JAN RUHTENBERG, COLORADO COORDINATOR, VIGILANT WOMEN FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mrs. RUHTENBERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Mrs. A. G. Jan Ruhtenberg, of El Paso County, past president of the El Paso County Republican Women. I am also a Vigilant Woman but I am speaking as an individual.

Mrs. Pemberton has already explained in general terms "The American Plan for U. N. Charter Revision" prepared by the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment. She was the speaker just before this last speaker.

Although it is unlikely that a review conference will adopt formal amendments to the U. N. Charter, the Senate should go on record next year in favor of amendments designed to safeguard United States participation in the U. N.

If you will now turn to appendix A, United Nations Charter amendments, I would like to summarize briefly the proposed charter amendments.

PREAMBLE CHANGES

We propose that the preamble should be amended to wipe out the fraudulent phrase, "We the people of the United Nations." No human being owes allegiance to the U. N. or ever voted for any U. N. delegate to represent him.

We propose that the preamble read:

The parties to the Charter of the United Nations Organization determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which three times in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind * * *

Accordingly, the United Nations Organization is hereby continued as a voluntary organization of sovereign nations having such functions and powers as are expressly granted to it by the following articles.

DELEGATED POWERS TO THE U. N.

Then we would propose a new paragraph on article 2. Even our Founding Fathers did not entrust the American President and Congress with the exercise of undelegated powers. However, many witnesses before the subcommittee have contended that the U. N. can exercise powers not delegated by its charter, even to the extent of evolving the U. N. into a world government by charter interpretation. Our proposed amendment would confine the U. N. to exercise the powers expressly delegated by the charter.

EXPULSION AND WITHDRAWAL

We suggest amending article 6 to say that—

A member of the United Nations who has persistently violated the principles contained in the charter may be expelled by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly and by any seven members of the Security Council.

We believe that U. N. members should stand up and be counted on the issue of continued Soviet participation.

We would add a paragraph to article 6 stating that a member may withdraw on 3 months' notice. The proposed addition would not let the important right to withdraw from the United Nations rest on mere implication.

REPEAL OF ARTICLES 53 AND 54

We propose the repeal of articles 53 and 54. Collective security through the United Nations is a dangerous delusion. Moreover, the collective security functions of the United Nations destroy its potential value as a diplomatic forum.

Our regional defense alliances do represent a shield against Communist aggression and should be cut loose from the Security Council by repealing articles 53 and 54.

AMENDMENTS OF ARTICLES 55 AND 56

Then we propose an amendment to articles 55 and 56. Few people imagined in 1945 that the vague human rights provisions stated in articles 55 and 56 of the charter we intended as self-executing legal obligations.

We propose amending these articles to prevent the human rights of Americans from being internationalized.

I am going to skip to the end. I think I am probably getting short.

We believe that the root of uneasiness about the U. N. is the well-founded suspicion that the American people will have little or nothing to say about charter revisions or about United States participation in the United Nations, but that they, powerless and unwilling may be drawn into some sort of world government from which there will be no escape.

This vigilant woman and thousands of others like me will fight to the last bridge to see that no quarter-world, half-world, or one-world government will be put upon the American people unaware, and that if revisions are made to the charter, they will be made with the full knowledge and consent of the American people in an open and constitutional manner.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Ruhtenberg.

Any questions?

Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Ruhtenberg is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. A. G. JAN RUHTENBERG, PAST PRESIDENT EL PASO COUNTY
REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Mrs. A. G. Jan Ruhtenberg, of El Paso County, past president of the El Paso County Republican Women. I am also a Vigilant Woman but am speaking as an individual.

Miss Pemberton has already explained in general terms "The American Plan for U. N. Charter Revision" prepared by the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment. Although it is unlikely that a review conference will adopt formal amendments to the U. N. Charter, the Senate should go on record next year in favor of amendments designed to safeguard United States participation in the U. N.

If you will now turn to appendix A, I would like to summarize briefly the proposed charter amendments.

PREAMBLE

We propose that the preamble should be amended to wipe out the fraudulent phrase: "We the peoples of the United Nations." No human being owes allegiance to the U. N. or ever voted for any U. N. delegate to represent him.

Also, the preamble should be amended to indicate that Korea was the third great war in our lifetime. A war in which we suffered 103,000 American casualties, 33,000 American dead with 4,000 to 6,000 American boys, according to General Van Fleet, still missing, dead or held prisoner, is not one to be forgotten.

NEW ARTICLE 2, SECTION 8

We would add a section to article 2.

Even our Founding Fathers did not trust the American President and Congress with the exercise of undelegated powers. However, many witnesses before the subcommittee have contended that the U. N. can exercise powers not delegated by its charter, even to the extent of evolving the U. N. into a world government by charter interpretation. Our proposed new section would confine the U. N. to the exercise of powers expressly delegated by the charter.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6

Of course, the Soviet Union would decline to ratify any charter amendment making its expulsion from the U. N. vetoproof. But we suggest amending article 6 to say "That a member of the U. N. which has persistently violated the principles contained in the charter, may be expelled by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly, and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council." We believe that U. N. members should stand up and be counted on the issue of continued Soviet participation.

And we would add a second section to article 6 stating that a member of the U. N. may withdraw from the organization on 3 months' notice. The proposed

addition to article 6 would not let the important right to withdraw from the U. N. rest on mere implication.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 17, SECTION 2

We would amend article 17, section 2 to place a ceiling of 25 percent on the contribution of any one member to the budget of the U. N. or any of its agencies.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF ARTICLES 53 AND 54

We propose the repeal of articles 53 and 54. Collective security through the U. N. is a dangerous delusion. Moreover, the collective security functions of the U. N. destroy its potential value as a diplomatic forum.

Our regional defense alliances do represent a shield against Communist aggression. They should be cut loose from the U. N. Security Council by repealing articles 53 and 54 of the charter.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES 55 AND 56

Few people imagined in 1945 that the vague human rights provisions stated in articles 55 and 56 of the charter were intended to be self-executing legal obligations. We propose to amend articles 55 and 56 to prevent the fundamental human rights of Americans from being internationalized.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 62

Obviously, a domestic jurisdiction clause limiting the U. N. should apply to the specialized agencies as well. We propose amending article 62 to say, "the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies shall not prepare any draft convention, make any recommendation, or take any other action under this article with respect to matters which are recognized as beyond the competence of the U. N."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 100

The charter should be amended to prevent a repetition of the disgraceful indemnification of disloyal Americans by the General Assembly.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 108

The "American plan" for U. N. Charter division would amend article 108 so that the future changes in important charter provisions could be effected only by formal amendments to the constitutions of U. N. member nations.

The root of all uneasiness about the U. N. is the well-founded suspicion that the American people will have little or nothing to say about United States participation in the U. N., but that they, powerless and unwilling, may be drawn into some sort of world government.

We will fight to the last bridge to see that no quarter-world, half-world, or one-world government shall be put upon the American people unaware.

And that if revisions are to be made to the U. N. Charter, that they will be made with the full knowledge and consent of the American people in an open and constitutional manner.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Awner. We are very glad to have you, sir.

Mr. AWNER. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MAX AWNER, COLORADO STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. AWNER. I am testifying on behalf of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, State affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. The State federation of labor represents approximately 75,000 members of A. F. of L. unions in the State of Colorado. The Colorado Labor Advocate, of which I am editor, is the official weekly newspaper of the State federation, as well as of 53 other labor organizations in this State.

COLORADO FEDERATION OF LABOR RESOLUTION

On June 3, 1950, at its annual convention, held in Denver, the Colorado State Federation of Labor adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the continued existence and welfare of working people the world over depends on avoidance of another world war and the creation of world conditions wherein a durable peace can be built; and

Whereas the United Nations, though it has a number of noteworthy accomplishments to its credit and on the basis of what it has done deserves the continued and wholehearted support of all peace-loving people, nevertheless has demonstrated that, as presently constituted, it is almost powerless to end the cold war; and

Whereas it is vital that the U. N. be given such powers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 55th Convention of the Colorado State Federation of Labor go on record as memorializing the American Federation of Labor to accept as its policy the favoring of the convening, as soon as possible, of a U. N. amending conference, as provided for in the U. N. Charter, with a view to eliminating the conditions that have caused the present international stalemate and building the U. N. into a true federation of nations, with a code of international law, a bill of human rights, an adequate international peace force, and any other machinery not otherwise inconsistent with the sovereignty of nations but found to be necessary for the maintenance of world law and order; and be it further

Resolved, That membership in any such world federation shall be open at all times to any nation willing to subscribe to the charter as drawn up; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the executive officers of the American Federation of Labor.

This resolution is further developed and brought up to date in written testimony already submitted to this committee.

I should also like with the permission of the chairman to add to my written testimony an editorial from a recent edition of the Labor Advocate, which I have here.

Senator SPARKMAN. That will be done.

(The editorial referred to is as follows:)

[From the Colorado Labor Advocate, December 31, 1954]

LOVE NOT TOO WELL, BUT WISELY

We hope everyone interested in world affairs reads the thought-provoking article by Robert C. Good in last Sunday's Denver Post. Titled "The Two-Front Fight," it makes the point that the United Nations is endangered as much by those who expect impossible things of it as by those who attack and try to destroy it.

One of the "false and dangerous" hopes of the U. N.-lovers, as Good calls them, is that the U. N. "can be transformed into a world government." The pro-U. N.'ers, he says "are endangering the U. N. because they insist it should be substantially strengthened, when in fact it cannot be." And Mr. Good makes an impressive case for the proposition that, under present world conditions, the U. N. indeed cannot be altered much.

The essential point in the article is that the U. N. is merely the mirror of world conflicts today. The author goes even further and says: "This is as it should be. If the U. N. were not a part of that conflict, it would be irrelevant to the most pressing problem in international relations today." In other words, he sees it as merely another instrument in the cold war—a bridge of sorts, perhaps, between the competing forces, but a bridge for facilitating mutual recrimination and attack, not friendly intercourse.

This is not to say that Mr. Good is an enemy of the U. N. or of world peace. He makes it clear that he sincerely supports all efforts to bring the two great opposing global forces together—within the framework of the U. N. as it now stands.

Yet his article is, from the larger point of view, essentially shortsighted, misleading, and detrimental to world cooperation and peace.

Where are the fallacies in his arguments?

They lie in the great gap between his lucid and entirely logical explanation of what the U. N. is, and what it must become if, by his own standards, it is to have a chance of easing world tensions and achieving a semblance of peace. He says:

"We must not give the U. N. jobs to do which it is not equipped to handle."

The obvious answer to that would seem to be to lose no time in giving the U. N. the equipment to handle those jobs—which we assume every sincere U. N. supporter, including Mr. Good, would like it to be able to handle. It is vacuous to say, on the one hand, that an agency is powerless to undertake a certain essential job, and on the other that we must make no attempt to afford it the necessary powers because if it had them it would be out of touch with the problem.

The dilemma we face today is not how to make the U. N. a more accurate mirror, a more integral part, of present world conflicts, as Mr. Good implies, but almost exactly the opposite: How to bring it to a point where it will be sufficiently above those conflicts to view them in meaningful perspective. Not above in the sense of being out of touch, God grant, but above in the sense that it may encompass in its scope and understanding all sides, and thus gain the vision and the insight to devise solutions.

Together with this vision and insight must come the power to implement whatever solutions are proposed. Call it strengthening the U. N., world law, world government or what you will, it must be faced and grappled with.

The U. N. has done some splendid work, even with its sharply circumscribed powers—as Mr. Good is quick to concede. We are also in accord that little in the way of dramatic steps toward true peace and stability should be expected of the world body as it now stands. We cannot understand how Mr. Good can turn his back on the natural progeny of these two antecedents: That we must build on this palpable but inchoate foundation a structure that, while utilizing and deriving some nourishment from the crumbs and crusts perfunctorily picked up along the way, will reach up and out toward new horizons in the world's search for peace and brotherhood.

Mr. AWNER. Now a word or two on another area of charter revision.

The primary considerations in amending the U. N. Charter must, I think, lie in the area of political, diplomatic, and military machinery. But I do not think we should overlook the vast possibilities in the realm of economics—or, to phrase it more broadly, human welfare.

STRENGTHENING THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The various specialized agencies of the U. N. have been doing a magnificent—and too little recognized—job in building up the health, intelligence, the technological know-how, and the basic friendship and human understanding of the people of the world. In the long run, this vital but unspectacular work may prove to be the foundation of the "brave new world" that many of us, despite the heartbreaking setbacks we have suffered in the past few years, dare to hope may still be born.

A Charter Review Conference, I think, should be given consideration to the possibility of strengthening these human welfare agencies of the U. N., and perhaps making them a more integral part of the structure of the world body. As the dislocations and confusions arising from the political and military tensions in the world subside—and we all fervently hope they will subside as the full force of world opinion and world determination is brought to bear upon them—these grassroots agencies will come into full flower as the expression of man's constant struggle toward a higher material, moral, and spiritual plane. We should help prepare and fertilize the ground now by giving full measure of support and encouragement to these agencies.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

EXPULSION OF MEMBERS

Senator KNOWLAND. I would just like to ask this: You indicate that the membership should be more or less universal in character, including at least any nations who agree to abide by the charter; is that correct?

Mr. Awner. That is right, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. If a nation is already a member but violates the letter and spirit of the charter or goes contrary to a resolution which is so loftily adopted by the organization, would you say that the power to expel such a nation should exist?

Mr. Awner. My personal opinion, sir, would be that the power should exist to expel such a nation upon vote of a designated majority or two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. That would be my personal opinion.

Senator KNOWLAND. The Senate is getting down to the point where our hearings are almost completed and the committee is going to have to make some recommendation, as will the Government of the United States in the event there is a charter revision session held and any action is taken. Let us be specific therefore. During the Korean war, when the United Nations Security Council called on all its members to resist aggression, out of the 60 members, some 17 of them, including the United States, helped in that effort. As you pointed out in your statement, about 90 percent of the manpower and the resources was furnished by the United States, but the others did participate to some degree.

Now, the Soviet Union, of course, contributed nothing, obviously, to the resistance of aggression in Korea. They gave moral support to the aggressor. Mr. Vyshinsky, during his lifetime, publicly admitted before the Security Council that they had furnished MIG planes; they had furnished tanks; they had furnished ammunition and guns for the country that had committed the aggression and had made war upon the United Nations in its efforts to uphold international law and order. Would you say that that would be pretty much a prima facie case of warranting expulsion?

Mr. Awner. Well, sir, I don't think it would be up to me to say whether I thought it would be a prima facie case. I think that if a member or members of the United Nations at the time of such an incident should deem it wise to move toward expulsion of such a member, then it would be up to the body itself to act upon that motion or resolution as submitted to the body.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Awner. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Awner is as follows:)

TESTIMONY OF MAX Awner, DENVER, COLO., EDITOR, COLORADO LABOR ADVOCATE

I am testifying on behalf of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, State affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. The State federation of labor represents approximately 75,000 members of AFL unions in the State of Colorado. The Colorado Labor Advocate, of which I am editor, is the official weekly newspaper of the State federation, as well as of 53 other labor organizations in this State.

On June 3, 1950, at its annual convention, held in Denver, the Colorado State Federation of Labor adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the continued existence and welfare of working people the world over depends on avoidance of another world war and the creation of world conditions wherein a durable peace can be built; and

"Whereas, the United Nations, though it has a number of noteworthy accomplishments to its credit and on the basis of what it has done deserves the continued and wholehearted support of all peace-loving people, nevertheless has demonstrated that, as presently constituted, it is almost powerless to end the cold war; and

"Whereas it is vital that the U. N. be given such powers: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the 55th Convention of the Colorado State Federation of Labor go on record as memorializing the American Federation of Labor to accept as its policy the favoring of the convening, as soon as possible, of a U. N. amending conference, as provided for in the U. N. Charter, with a view to eliminating the conditions that have caused the present international stalemate and building the U. N. into a true federation of nations, with a code of international law, a bill of human rights, an adequate international police force, and any other machinery not otherwise inconsistent with the sovereignty of nations but found to be necessary for the maintenance of world law and order; and be it further

"Resolved, That membership in any such world federation shall be open at all times to any nation willing to subscribe to the charter as drawn up; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the executive officers of the American Federation of Labor."

This resolution is further developed and brought up to date in written testimony already submitted to this committee. As you all know, 3 weeks after this resolution was adopted in Denver, the United States and many of its fellow members of the United Nations were plunged into a localized but nevertheless terribly costly war, or police action as it was called, in Korea.

There is little profit in historical theorizing or second guessing, but I do not think it is unreasonable to suggest that if, some time between 1945 and 1950, steps had been taken to give the United Nations real powers to keep order in the world, the course of history might have been profoundly altered. The prompt action of the United States did, of course, result in vigorous meeting and throwing back of the initial North Korean aggression. The army that fought in Korea was called a United Nations army. Yet, if we are to be honest, I think we must concede that it was a U. N. army in name only, that outside of United States and South Korean forces only more or less token aid was rendered by U. N. members.

I think it is generally accepted by military and political analysts that the North Korean Communists attacked because they assumed there would be little or no resistance; if they had foreseen the consequences they would have thought twice before undertaking such an adventure.

If there had been a United Nations international police force, or even the machinery for promptly mobilizing one, I think it would have been enough to deter the Korean aggression. This is not even taking into account the possibility that if measures to strengthen the U. N. had been taken before the cold war had reached the peak of intensity it has maintained since mid-1950, a system of disarmament might have been devised which would have made highly unlikely any such adventure as the North Korean aggression.

I realize that with every passing year the task of undoing the tremendous damage, the bitter hatreds and the inflexible attitudes engendered by the cold war becomes more difficult. We must certainly assume that achieving an accommodation between the free world and the Communist world would be a much more formidable process today than it would have been, say, in 1947 or 1948, given a commensurate effort and an equivalent awareness of the need.

All this argues, of course, not for abandoning the effort, but for pursuing it with all the energy and dedication at our command, while there is still some hope of success. The alternatives, none of us need be told, are too horrible to contemplate.

We must take a bold step in the direction of world law and order. Some would advocate, as such a bold step, some dramatic gesture on the part of this country, such as unilateral disarmament. Such a step would indeed be a bold one—but would it be a wise one? Most Americans would agree, I am sure, that it would be the height of foolhardiness.

But would not American leadership in efforts toward mutual agreement on strengthening of the U. N. Charter be both a bold and a wise move? The United States can step into that role of the bold and wise leader by taking a vigorous

and forthright stand for convening a U. N. Amending Conference as soon as possible. Such a United States move should of course make it clear that we are determined to explore and pursue every possible means of strengthening the U. N. as an instrument of world law and order, not leaving the suspicion that we are doing it merely out of noblesse oblige or some motive of self-interest—even so-called enlightened self-interest.

Now a word or two on another area of charter revision. The primary considerations in amending the U. N. Charter must, I think, lie in the area of political, diplomatic, and military machinery. But I do not think we should overlook the vast possibilities in the realm of economics—or, to phrase it more broadly, human welfare.

The various specialized agencies of the U. N. have been doing a magnificent—and too little recognized—job in building up the health, the intelligence, the technological know-how and the basic friendship and human understanding of the peoples of the world. In the long run, this vital but unspectacular work may prove to be the foundation of the brave new world that many of us, despite the heartbreaking setbacks we have suffered in the past few years, dare to hope may still be born.

A charter review conference, I think, should give consideration to the possibility of strengthening these human welfare agencies of the U. N., and perhaps making them a more integral part of the structure of the world today. As the dislocations and confusions arising from the political and military tensions in the world subside—and we all fervently hope they will subside as the full force of world opinion and world determination is brought to bear upon them—these grassroots agencies will come into full flower as the expression of man's constant struggle toward a higher material, moral, and spiritual plane. We should help prepare and fertilize the ground now by giving a full measure of support and encouragement to these agencies.

Senator SPARKMAN. Miss Harper.

Miss Harper, are you speaking for the Colorado Federation of Teachers?

Miss HARPER. I am.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you with us.

Miss HARPER. And these statements are taken from resolutions adopted by the Federation in State convention.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF FLORENCE S. HARPER, DELEGATE, DENVER FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, LOCAL NO. 858, AND COLORADO FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Miss HARPER. I preface this, "We believe."

1. The charter and the United Nations with the progress achieved must be maintained and strengthened in spite of disappointments and failures at times incurred. This is the only hope we have for peace and survival.

2. Charter review should be undertaken to explore and reveal all possibilities of strength and provisions existent in the charter but still undeveloped and unused.

3. Charter revision where desirable should be undertaken with great caution, preserving the strength already established, the progress achieved and indeed maintaining the basic principles, purposes and ideas of the charter itself.

4. Means must be developed to establish effective police power enabling the United Nations to take immediate concerted action in any area of the world where the peace is threatened. Neither single nations nor small groups of nations can consistently under the charter

undertake the responsibility of trying to stop aggression or to keep the peace. This responsibility must be assumed by all member nations.

5. International laws should be codified to establish standards of moral conduct between nations and of justice for all. The International Court of Justice should function in enforcing these measures, and helping such measures function.

6. It is inconsistent to utilize the power of veto in determining action to preserve the peace since the major purpose of the charter and United Nations is to establish and preserve peace.

7. The special agencies of the United Nations, UNESCO, WHO, FAO, UNICEF, technical-assistance, and exchange-of-person programs are a vital and integral part of the United Nations overall structure. These are the fundamental bases of international understanding, appreciation, and cooperation among all peoples. Therefore the services of these agencies should be strengthened and expanded without regard to expense or effort. How much cheaper that is than war, after all. This is the way to personal dignity, self-sufficiency, and independence among people. It is the most successful means of combating the spread of communism.

This is presented by the Denver Federation of Teachers and Colorado Federation of Teachers.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have one question, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield.

THE VETO QUESTION

Senator MANSFIELD. Miss Harper, from your sixth recommendation, I am unable to determine whether you are in favor of maintaining the veto or eliminating it.

Miss HARPER. No. We would eliminate it.

Senator MANSFIELD. I see. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Entirely?

Miss HARPER. In this particular instance.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are you familiar with the Vandenberg resolution?

Miss HARPER. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. Do you endorse it, with reference to the veto?

Miss HARPER. I am not sure whether the Vandenberg—Would it entirely do away with the veto?

Senator SPARKMAN. No. As I recall, briefly stated, it would eliminate it except in cases in which a nation's own armed forces might be involved.

Miss HARPER. We took this from resolutions in the State convention, and we felt that this statement was as far as we could go on the resolutions passed in State convention. However, we felt that we would be secure in saying that we would use it also in admission of members.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Miss HARPER. But those would be the two that we would specify.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Miss Harper.

Mr. Williams.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Williams, the next witness will be Mr. LaRoy Purdy.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Williams.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN A. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT, THE COLORADO SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking here on behalf of the Colorado Society, Sons of the American Revolution. I am the president at the present time of that society. We have over 200 members in the State.

SUPPORT FOR BRICKER AMENDMENT

The interest of the Colorado Society, Sons of the American Revolution in possible changes and amendments to the Charter of the United Nations stems from its interest and advocacy of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States. We consider that no amendments to the United Nations Charter should be proposed and advocated by the United States until that Bricker amendment or some similar amendment is adopted to the United States Constitution, preserving to Americans their liberty, freedom, and independence in internal affairs.

In this connection the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution concurs fully with both the spirit and letter of the resolutions passed by both of the last two national Congresses of the Sons of the American Revolution, supporting the Bricker amendment, and we desire to go on record here before this subcommittee as staunch supporters of said amendment.

The Sons of the American Revolution have as basic requirement for membership lineal descent from an ancestor who was at all times unfailing in his loyalty to, and rendered active service in, the cause of American independence, either as an officer, soldier, seaman, marine, militiaman, or minute man, in the armed forces of the Continental Congress, or of any of the several Colonies or States, or as a signer of the Declaration of Independence; or as a member of a Committee of Safety or Correspondence; or as a member of any Continental, Provincial or Colonial Congress or Legislature; or as a recognized patriot who performed actual service by overt acts of resistance to the authority of Great Britain. The Sons of the American Revolution have always been zealous in protecting and defending the basic concepts of our domestic government and our national institutions; to the end that we may always have a government of laws and not of men and that we may pass on, unimpaired our Constitution, with its Bill of Rights, and our way of life to our posterity.

Briefly stated the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution take the following positions:

1. We are firm believers and advocates of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and believe that its spirit should be the rule and guide by which we should judge possible amendments to the United Nations Charter.

2. We are opposed to any amendment of the Constitution of the United States by treaty, including the United Nations Charter, without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States to all such amendments to our Constitution effected by such treaties.

3. We believe that the charter of the United Nations is properly a contract between the signatory sovereign nations to become members of an international organization, and is not a constitution for a world government or a super state.

4. We believe that each of the contracting parties to the United Nations Charter has the absolute right to withdraw from the United Nations and that such right should be expressly stated in the United Nations Charter.

5. We believe that the Bricker amendment will reestablish the original intent of the Founding Fathers as regards the treaty-making power, limiting it to external and foreign affairs as distinguished from internal and domestic matters, which are properly and solely controlled by our United States Constitution.

6. We believe that the fundamental rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and enjoyed by each individual citizen should not be confounded by any possible provision of any treaty, including the United Nations Charter.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Purdy.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Purdy, the next witness will be Mr. Edgar N. Becker.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Mr. Purdy.

STATEMENT OF LA ROY H. PURDY, DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 8, COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO

Mr. PURDY. Senator Sparkman, Senators Knowland and Mansfield, Mr. Mayor, and Congressman Rogers, my name is LaRoy H. Purdy. I am director of District 8 of the Communications Workers of America, CIO. I not only represent the 14,000 men and women employed in the telephone communications industry in the Mountain State area, but also represent the 350,000 telephone men and women employed in both the independent telephone industry and in the Bell System.

I am appearing today on behalf of my union to make clear that it fully believes in and supports the United Nations. And incidentally, I might say that we are against the Bricker amendment. The union's official position is expressed in a statement of foreign policy which was unanimously passed by a convention of 2,500 delegates in our convention last year. The statement says in part:

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

The United Nations and its forum for discussion of world problems must continue to be developed and strengthened as a real, sustaining, and substantial force among all nations. * * * It calls attention to the provision for charter review in 1955 and notes the fact that the member nations have voted for such a review on several occasions. It points out that the Senate has established a committee to study and determine such charter revision. It urges our organization to inform our members of the facts relating to charter revision to the conclusion that union members may supply intelligent leadership in their respective communities.

The complete statement is attached to my testimony.

DESTRUCTIVENESS OF MODERN WEAPONS

Much has been written concerning the potential for destruction of modern weapons. The whole situation can perhaps be summed up by the answer to the question, "What are the three sizes of the atomic bomb?" The answer is, "small, medium, and where did everybody go."

The inadequacy of actual defense in an atomic shooting war and the possibility of civilian panic in such a war need only be mentioned. Concerning the economic aspects of the present dilemma in which we find ourselves, we support the contention that modern war has become too expensive a luxury for the human race to indulge in. I need only point out that of the present tax dollar 85 percent goes to past, present, and future wars.

As an attachment to my testimony I have included a recent editorial in the Denver Post. The figures used were compiled by the Institute of Life Insurance on the cost of the Federal Government from 1789 to 1953. The editorial states:

During the 165-year period covering the life of the Republic, the total outlay figure amounted to \$888 billion. Of this cost 82 percent was accumulated in the 13-year period starting in 1940. Of the latter total 63 percent, or \$457 billions, went to military expenditures.

The editorial goes on to say:

So wars—the preparation therefor and the cost thereof—are threatening slow economic strangulation to our way of life.

The editorial further states:

The threats of war are draining away almost two-thirds of our own national budget. If that intolerable trend is to be arrested it will be by a collective world effort and not by a United States decision alone.

The editorial concludes:

Such facts and figures reduce generalized skepticism toward collective world organization and security to vaporous nonsense. The isolationists believe that they alone are realists. They are, in fact, dreamers who in their somnolence, would let this country collapse economically while leaving the people prey to external and internal enemies.

We know that the United Nations provides the foundation on which the structure of durable peace can be erected. We also agree with Mr. Dulles when he stated before the American Bar Association, August 26, 1953, that the United Nations Charter was an inadequate, preatomic charter. In the same address he also said:

One of the inadequacies—
resulted from—

disregard for the fact that world order, in the long run, depends not on men, but upon law, law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality.

REVISE CHARTER TO MAKE IT MORE EFFECTIVE

We wish to urge our representatives to continue to support the calling of a charter review conference, and should it be called, we urge them to do everything possible to keep the United Nations the effective instrument that it is, but also to use every opportunity that the conference would afford to support any revisions that might make the charter even more effective.

Specifically we should like to urge the principle of universality. We would like also to wish our representatives to urge our Government not to take any unilateral action. We urge our Government to do everything possible to give the United Nations the power to enforce universal disarmament under proper and legal safeguards. We feel that the representatives of our Nation should have a detailed plan for the achievement and enforcement of universal disarmament, and the principles of such a plan should be the basic condition for the United States agreement to permanent settlement of major political disputes.

In closing, I would like to say this: We would like to urge our representatives in our Government to take a constructive leadership part in the matters which have been discussed here, so that we can regain the moral, spiritual, and world leadership. Such constructive leadership would help us seize the moral and political initiative from the Soviet Union and do much to convince the peoples of the free world that our purpose is not merely to recruit allies in the cold war, but also to achieve with them a solution for common world problems.

As Shakespeare once said:

Our doubts are traitors and make us lose the good we oft might win by fearing to attempt.

In conclusion, we should like to warn that civilization, as we know it, its progress and its aspirations, hang in the balance. The problems are great, and there is not too much time.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; I have a question or two.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland.

COOPERATION OF COMMUNISTS NEEDED

Senator KNOWLAND. You are familiar, of course, with the fact that in the past 10 years international communism has increased its control from 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain to over 800 million people behind the Iron Curtain; are you not?

Mr. PURDY. Yes; I agree with that.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, the United States, under the last administration as well as under this one, has sought to find an area of agreement for disarmament. There is the President's proposal of atoms for peace.

You are familiar with the obstacles that the Soviet Union has thrown into reaching effective agreements?

Mr. PURDY. Yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. Do you believe that you can have an effective system of disarmament either in the conventional or the atomic field without an adequate inspection system?

Mr. PURDY. It would have to be completely adequate, Senator.

Senator KNOWLAND. You would not want this country to dispose of its weapons and rely solely on the word of the Soviet Union that it was going to dispose of its weapons, would you?

Mr. PURDY. No. We could not do that.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that in any event, you cannot have these things unless you can get the cooperation of the Soviet Government to make an inspection system effective in every sense of the word?

Mr. PURDY. I might say this, Senator, that the same economic pressure that we feel—and some of the figures I have read here—perhaps also exist within the Soviet Union. I do feel this, that if we can regain somewhat—and perhaps we have not lost it—the world leadership that we once had, that was handed to us on a platter, and if we could move ahead and we could take away the political initiative from the Soviet Union and do much to convince the peoples of the world that we are not attempting to gain allies so much as we are attempting to do something to solve common problems, common world problems. I believe that even a coalition of the free world, based not on voluntary association, but maybe on an international law of some sort, would be much cheaper on the rest of us, even with the Soviet Union out, and be much safer, perhaps, for the free world, if we could have a legal association, bound by law, rather than a voluntary one, and it would result in a more adequate pooling of our resources should we have to fight in a war of aggression or against an aggressor nation.

Senator KNOWLAND. One of the problems that we are confronted with is that the totalitarian system of the Communist world, their complete control of the press and radio and television and sources of information, unfortunately does not allow the debates that take place in the United Nations in New York, which are widely disseminated in the free world, to get behind the Iron Curtain where they perhaps are most needed.

Mr. PURDY. I agree with that, too.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Purdy is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY LARoy PURDY, DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 8, COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO

My name is LaRoy H. Purdy and I reside at 3200 South Delaware, Englewood, Colo. As director of District 8 of the Communications Workers of America, CIO, I represent 14,000 men and women employed in the telephone communications industry in the Mountain States area, comprised of Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Tex. The Communications Workers of America, of which I am an executive board member, represents 350,000 telephone men and women employed in both the independent telephone industry and in the Bell System.

I am appearing here today on behalf of my international union to make clear that it fully believes in and supports the United Nations. I wish to commend President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, and our United Nations delegates for their efforts on our behalf in developing and strengthening the United Nations so that it has become a real and substantial force not only for world peace but also in its efforts to establish better living and health standards, and higher cultural achievements for the people of the world. We know that the United Nations provides the foundation on which the structure of a durable peace can be erected. We also wish to urge our delegates, representing the United States in the United Nations, to continue to support the calling of a charter review conference. Should such a conference be called, we wish to urge them to do everything possible to not only keep the United Nations the collective instrument that it is, but also to utilize every opportunity, that such a conference affords, to support any revisions to the United Nations Charter that would make it an even more effective instrument for world peace and for human welfare.

The Communications Workers of America realizes that the welfare of its members is closely related to what happens in the United Nations. They have

become aware that action taken by the United Nations is of the utmost importance to the welfare of every citizen, and their very survival may depend upon a strengthened and effective United Nations. They sincerely believe that through the United Nations, a peaceful world can be achieved; a world in which security of person and property of every citizen is guaranteed without loss of honor or justice.

The position of my union is reflected in that section of our statement on foreign policy which was unanimously passed by the 2,500 delegates at our international convention held in Cleveland, Ohio, June 21-25, 1954. The pertinent paragraphs, under the subhead, "United Nations," is as follows:

"The United Nations and its forum for discussion of world problems must continue to be developed and strengthened as a real, sustaining, and substantial force among all nations. There is a tendency to limit the work of the United Nations to the area of physical armed conflict with its issue of war or peace. Actually, the establishment of better living and health standards, better conditions of labor and the attainment of higher cultural achievements for all people are the real objectives which are sought. We urge that the United States and Canada continue to support and participate in the programs of the United Nations to the conclusion that men might seek peace and justice among men rather than to choose war and oppression.

"The United Nations Charter contains a provision for review of the charter in 1955 and the member nations have voted in plenary session to make such a review. The Senate of the United States has established a committee to study and determine such charter revision. Religious organizations are taking action to inform their members of the need to revise the United Nations Charter. Labor organizations must take action to inform their members of the facts relating to charter revision to the conclusion that union members may supply intelligent leadership in their respective communities. We in CWA will continue constructive effort through our executive board to initiate programs and interest among our members informing them of the need for and the progress of charter revision."

Humanity today is living in a new age—the atomic—and we are cognizant of the fact that the potentials are both inspiring and terrifying. We sincerely feel that unless something more is done, America and the world face either one of two inevitabilities—either (1) a shooting atomic war; or (2) the end result of the cost of the present necessary armament race, including progress in adequate defense. The first is, of course, almost total destruction of human life and property, should an atomic shooting war start—a war that no one will win—and for which there are no adequate safeguards or defense to prevent almost total physical destruction. We know that in the world, as it exists to day, atomic bombers could pass each other tonight, and we could awaken tomorrow—if we awakened at all—in a totally altered world. The second inevitability, even though no shooting atomic war should start, is that the staggering cost of modern armament, if it continues, can only result in a lower standard of living for our people, and finally, financial bankruptcy for all nations because the cost of war has become too great a "luxury" for the human race to indulge in. With both actual war and its threat there is, of course, the accompanying disintegration of established moral and spiritual values won at so great a sacrifice and cost in the past. We believe now that it is time that something be done to bring order at the international level instead of anarchy.

Much has been written and said concerning the potential for destruction of modern weapons. The whole situation can, perhaps, be summed up by the answer to the question, "What are the three sizes of the atomic bomb?" The answer is, "Small, medium, and where did everybody go?" We have now reached a stage where a hydrogen bomb—detonated by one individual—can completely cremate the population of greater New York. I need only point out that if recent press releases are reliable, it would take only 10 cobalt bombs to completely and effectively clear away all life on this planet except some organisms in the deep sea. Much also has been said about the lack of actual defense in an atomic war, and the impossibility of adequate civilian defense, under its terrific impact, needs only to be mentioned.

There are other ramifications such as the danger of radioactivity from fallout resulting from atomic bomb tests. I should like to say, in passing, that the problem concerned with the byproduct waste of building atomic bombs is also pertinent. Many of these byproducts are deadly poisonous to human life for a period up to 20,000 years, and what to do with this waste is a problem of

tremendous importance to every man, woman, and child in America—one that should, perhaps, be reviewed and discussed in the United Nations.

In support of the second inevitability, should no atomic shooting war become a reality, I should like to dwell, for a moment, on the economic consequences of the present dilemma in which we find ourselves. In support of my contention that modern war has become too great a luxury for the human race to indulge in, I need only point out that of the present tax dollar, 85 cents goes for past, present, and future wars. Of this 85 cents, 60 cents goes to the military services, 5 cents to veterans, 13 cents to carrying out international rearmament programs, and 7 cents represents interest. Of the remaining 15 cents, 4 cents is allocated to atomic energy, defense production, merchant marine, and other defense activities; 3 cents goes to social welfare, health education, housing, old-age assistance, etc.; 3 cents goes to general government administration, natural resources, etc.; and 3 cents goes to the aid of business, RFC, postal and airline subsidies, trade promotion, rivers and harbors, etc. The remaining 2 cents goes to agriculture, price supports, research, and marketing, etc. Of the tax dollar, 36 cents comes from direct taxes on individuals; 32 cents from direct taxes on corporations; 17 cents from new taxes and borrowing; 11 cents from excise taxes; and 4 cents from customs and other taxes.

Oversimplification is dangerous, but it takes only a moment of thought to see that approximately all the vast ramifications of our Government, outside the military, could be paid for by excise taxes and customs, and other like taxes, with reflecting tax reductions to both individuals and corporations, and with no new taxes or borrowing.

Supporting evidence that America is on the path to financial destruction can be found in the figures recently compiled by the Institute of Life Insurance on the Cost of our Federal Government From 1789 to 1953. These figures were published in a recent editorial in the Denver Post. I have added the editorial as an attachment to this testimony and should like to quote as follows: "During the 165-year period covering the life of the Republic, the total outlay figure amounted to \$888 billion. During the same period, Uncle Sam took in \$627 billion. The current public debt is \$270 billion.

"Of almost \$1 trillion in cost, 82 percent, or \$730 billion was accumulated in the 13-year period starting in 1940. Of the latter total, military expenditures came to \$457 billion, or 63 percent. Interest on the debt has amounted to \$55 billion, or 7 percent, during that time. And all other Government expenditures have taken \$217 billion, which amounts to only 30 percent of the total. The great part of the tax toll then has been to pay for hot and cold wars. In the 40 years since passage of the 16th amendment which authorized the income tax on individuals and corporations, that tax has dredged up \$440 billion, or nearly two-thirds of all the money collected by the Treasury in 165 years. So wars—the preparation therefor and the cost thereof—are threatening slow economic strangulation to our way of life. And there seems to be little letup.

"But the one area of economy that really counts involves savings that Americans alone cannot afford to make alone. The costs of modern weapons, their development, their perfection, and their constant replacement as obsolescence sets in are frightful. And during the present twilight period of international world organization, while the United States is bearing the money burden of both domestic defense and military assistance abroad, the threats of war are draining away almost two-thirds of our own national budget. If that intolerable trend is to be arrested it will be by a collective world effort and not by a United States decision alone.

"Such facts and figures reduce generalized skepticism toward collective world organization and security to vaporous nonsense. The isolationists believe they alone are realists. They are, in fact, dreamers who, in their somnolence, would let this country collapse economically while leaving the people prey to external and internal enemies."

The United Nations remains our one tool for world peace in a world in which only anarchy exists in the family of nations. An illustration might be that of a frontier society, such as we had in the West many years ago, in which every man wore a gun and was a law unto himself, and there existed no security for anyone.

It can also be said that those tensions that existed in that frontier society, together with the tensions that exist today among nations, are a consequence of the absence of a constitutional structure that gives security. A survey of history shows that the human race has made progress only when constitutional law and order became a reality. Of the latter, there are three essential factors—the

power to initiate law, the power to enforce law, and the power to interpret it. The United Nations, a voluntary association, was given only limited powers to initiate law and to interpret law at the World Court at the Hague—and no power at all to enforce it.

Even with these limited tools, the United Nations has been outstanding in its accomplishments and in its contribution to world peace and to the welfare of all people: particularly, through its humanitarian arms. However, we agree with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles when he stated before the American Bar Association on August 26, 1953, as follows: "The United Nations Charter now reflects serious inadequacies. One inadequacy sprang from ignorance. When we were in San Francisco in the spring of 1945, none of us knew of the atomic bomb which was to fall on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. The charter is thus a preatomic age charter. In this sense it was obsolete before it actually came into force. As one who was at San Francisco, I can say with confidence that if the delegates there had known that the mysterious and immeasurable power of the atom would be available as a means of mass destruction, the provisions of the charter dealing with disarmament and the regulation of armaments would have been far more emphatic and realistic." Mr. Dulles then continued, "One of the inadequacies of the United Nations Charter came out of disregard for the fact that world order, in the long run, depends not on men, but upon law, law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality."

There are those who feel that perhaps charter revision is not necessary, and that in opening the door, we may lose the good that the United Nations presently reflects. We can only point out that there are four main groups presently in the United Nations that are for charter review—for separate reasons, of course—and that in the plenary sessions of the United Nations, the nations voted 55 to 5 for a review conference. The groups opposed are, of course, the Soviet Union and the four satellite nations.

In view of these facts, we wish to uphold the position taken by Secretary Dulles in his testimony before this same committee on January 18, 1954, when he stated, "We are now approaching a time when in all probability there will be a review of the charter with a view to its possible amendment. Article 109 (3) of the charter provides that a proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of the 10th annual session of the General Assembly, i. e., that of 1955, and present indications are that a review conference will be held."

We further uphold the position of the United States Government as reflected by Mr. Dulles' statement: "The United States has already indicated that it expects to favor the holding of a review conference."

Therefore, if charter revision comes about through a charter review conference, for the sake of ourselves and our posterity, it is essential that the people of America be ready to meet the challenge—and not be found waiting.

As a result, we again urge our United States delegates to do everything possible to make possible a charter review conference, and as the opportunity arises, to do everything possible to strengthen the United Nations Charter by revision, for the United Nations remains the one last instrument that guards the peoples of the world from the total destruction of human life resulting from an atomic-shooting war.

Concerning the specifics for strengthening the present charter, the detailed mechanics are, of course, the work of statesmen, international lawyers, and others who are experts in the international field. Again, we should like to support the principles of universality as propounded by Secretary Dulles when he said before this same committee, "It seems at the present time that most of the members of the United Nations feel that it is better to have even discordant members in the organization rather than to attempt to confine membership to those who hold the same views."

We also wish to urge that no government, including our own, take any unilateral action, but should conversely first attempt at resolving the problem through the United Nations. The United Nations must be empowered to enforce universal disarmament with proper safeguards under just law. We also wish to support our Government's position as reflected by Mr. Dulles in his statements concerning an enforceable, workable disarmament. Our delegates should have a detailed plan for the achievement and enforcement of universal disarmament, and the principles of such a plan should be the basic condition for United States agreement to permanent settlement of major political disputes. We also wish to applaud President Eisenhower's position on the pooling of atomic resources.

Perhaps I am naive, but it would seem that a first step might be the initiating of a world law outlawing war, and the means established that the law be en-

forced not by voluntary association, but by a collective security bound by law.

The members of the United Nations would then be bound by law to cooperatively put down any violation of the law taken by any outlaw aggressor nation. It would appear to us that such a coalition of the free world, bound not by treaty, but by law, would be a step in the right direction and would balance out the responsibilities, including financial, and would be more safe and more economical in the long run, if the present necessary arms race continues. It would also enable us to live the American way of life to the full, rather than expending so much effort defending it at home and advertising it abroad.

We, therefore, call for the support and strengthening of the United Nations and such amendments to its charter to enable it to achieve universal disarmament with adequate legal safeguards. This would mean that there must be an acceptable means for the control of individual nations under any United Nations function of this kind. It would mean that the revenue to support the United Nations would have to be raised directly, for it must have dependable revenue for carrying out its security powers and duties. One way lies, perhaps, in President Eisenhower's proposal for pooling of all fissionable materials and to devise methods whereby it could be used to the greatest advantage to the welfare of mankind. It would seem that as our knowledge and functions of the fissionable materials increases, this alone would reflect a great source of revenue in support of the United Nations.

The strengthening of the United Nations would also probably include the problem of strengthening the World Court and the developing of adequate international law so that enforcement of disarmament and other means of outlawing of war could be made, not only on nations, but on individuals as well.

In addition, means must be found to enlarge the area of the United Nations humanitarian functions to meet the human needs over the world. These are the generalizations for which specifics must be found.

As stated above, we feel that charter review will take place. We know that the Soviet Union can neither prevent the calling of a review conference nor the adoption of recommended charter amendments. We also know that before such amendments can become effective, they must be ratified by two-thirds of the member nations. Ratification will, of course, take many years, but we should like to point out that while the nations of the world and their peoples are debating ratification, the chances of an itchy trigger finger starting a world war lessen. We know that during the ratification period, the United Nations Charter would continue in force, and all the United Nations' activities would go on with nothing eliminated or diminished. We also feel that over these years, there will be a mounting pressure and moral force upon those nations who have not ratified or who are impeding progress toward international security. Of course, over all this, hangs a sword of Damocles, as each year brings newer and more effective atomic weapons, even more horrible in their potential total destruction of human life.

It is encouraging to know that not only is labor vitally interested, but also men of industry, and I should like to refer, in this testimony, to the article, in the January 1955 issue Fortune, entitled, "The Fabulous Future," by David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America.

Lastly, if these problems are to be met, it is inevitable that each nation must surrender a bit of its autonomy. The best answer is perhaps that which appeared in the April 12 issue of Time magazine which is, of course, published by Henry R. Luce. On page 24 of that issue is the following: "The H-bomb's existence requires the United States to put much more strongly the case for international control of atomic weapons. Such control might impair unlimited national sovereignty as the world now knows it. It might imply a measure of world government. But the United States need not flinch at this prospect. Its own political history encourages the chance of a constitutional solution of a force so big that it calls for supranational control." For the convenience of the committee, the entire article is added as an attachment to this testimony.

As to the question whether this represents Mr. Luce's position, I can only quote Mr. Luce in a recent speech he made in Washington, November 17, 1954, in which he discussed the problems of war and peace. Mr. Luce stated that this question of peace is easier to ignore, "but like the hound of heaven, will pursue you. The fact is, there can be no peace without law—no freedom either. Personally, I wish that right now the United States would be putting herself in the forefront of the great worldwide concern for law and the rule of law * * * and the United States cannot move forward in this, its historic mission to promote the rule of law, unless the intellectuals have schooled them-

selves—and us—to know and to speak of the great concepts of law as the necessary counterpart of liberty and the actual basis of peace between men and nations. * * * Let us speak no more then of hopeless roadblocks lying across the path of the future. Peace is our objective; the advancement of the rule of law is the means. We have little time to waste. * * *

These quotes are out of the context, and the deletions are ours, but I am taking the liberty of adding an attachment containing excerpts not only from Mr. Luce's address, but also quotes from addresses by Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States; the late Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court; John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; and Bernard M. Baruch.

In conclusion, if in these matters discussed above, the United States Government takes a constructive leadership part, we can, perhaps, again regain the moral, spiritual, and world leadership that we have lost, in some part, perhaps, through no fault of our own. Such constructive leadership on our part would help us seize the moral and political initiative from the Soviet Union and do much to convince the peoples of the free world that our purpose is not merely to recruit allies in the "cold war," but also to achieve with them a solution for common world problems. In that leadership, dedicated to the proposition that man can and will exercise his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, lies the power of hope to a despairing world.

These are times that demand daring men of courage, imagination, and goodwill. As the Christian Science Monitor stated, in a recent editorial: "But few honest individuals will claim that their thought is as free from ignorance, prejudice, or hate as they would wish. Few will claim that their sense of brotherhood is as deep and broad and active as a clearer understanding of God's Fatherhood could make it. Is there not plenty of opportunity for each of us to begin the disarmament process?"

We sincerely believe that a knowledge of the dangers we face in an atomic world has created a climate that will bring about a desire for peace, security, in an ordered world, governed by the principles of law, justice, and freedom. We believe the men of goodwill and intellectual integrity—armed with faith and prayer—can do the job.

I should like to conclude with a quote from Shakespeare: "Our doubts are traitors and make us lose the good we oft might win by fearing to attempt."

In conclusion, we should like to warn that civilization, as we know it, its progress and its aspirations, hang in the balance. The problems are great—and there is not too much time.

(The attachments referred to are on file with the committee.)

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Becker.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Becker, the witness will be Mr. Robert Perkin.

STATEMENT OF EDGAR N. BECKER, JOHN S. STEWART POST, NO. 1, DEPARTMENT OF COLORADO, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. BECKER. My name is Ed Becker. I am Americanism committee chairman of District 1, Department of Colorado, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and for purposes of today's meeting before this honorable subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have also been authorized to represent the entire department of Colorado.

At this point I might say that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a truly democratic organization, and that there is no dictator or policy-maker at the top who expresses his personal opinion as the official expression of the rank and file membership.

On all subjects wherein the Veterans of Foreign Wars takes action such action usually starts with some rank-and-file member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars asking that a resolution be adopted at the post or city level. This resolution will be debated pro and con by the membership of the post and, if adopted, will then be sent to the

next higher level, which is the district council, composed of delegates from several posts in a community consisting of one or more counties.

Here it is again debated, and if passed, will then go to the department or State level. If accepted by this larger group of delegates the resolution then goes to the national encampment, where, if accepted, it becomes the national policy of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, representing nearly 2 million veterans.

So the statement which I shall summarize for you and which was presented to our body on the 8th of March of this year, represents the majority opinion of the national membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, where it states a résumé of the individual opinions of the membership.

Often, as in this case, the department resolutions on the same subject came from several different departments and were adopted as a part of the Veterans of Foreign Wars policy at the 1954 national encampment held in Philadelphia, Pa.

FINANCING THE U. N.

To summarize this Veterans of Foreign Wars policy in regard to a review of the United Nations Charter, I wish to state that the burden of financing the operations and functions of the United Nations be more equally distributed among the participating countries on the basis of their present economic resources, which have been greatly rejuvenated since the close of World War II:

That all other participating countries be required to accept a greater share of these operating costs in a way that will substantially reduce the tremendous burden of cost that the United States has been forced to absorb ever since the United Nations was founded;

That the Charter of the United Nations should be amended in a way that will deny countries the opportunity to obstruct and defeat the fundamental aims of the United Nations;

That the Charter of the United Nations should be amended in a way that will henceforth require of all member nations equal sacrifices, both in money and manpower, in proportion to their respective resources when the United Nations votes to resist aggression in any part of the world.

WORLD GOVERNMENT OPPOSED

We are definitely opposed to any amendment to the charter that will alter the veto power, impose world power upon members of the United Nations, give the United Nations the power to tax, establish an involuntary world military force, contravene in the slightest the rights of American citizenship guaranteed by our Bill of Rights.

In further summarization, I wish to state that we are definitely opposed to any change of the United Nations Charter that will lead to its being a so-called one-world or world federation, and we will actively oppose all individuals or groups who would make such changes.

From these statements I do not wish to give the thought that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is against the United Nations, for just as 10 years ago we instructed our leaders to take a leading part in having the United Nations Charter adopted, so today we still unanimously believe in the same principles that led to its adoption, and at the proper

time and place, we will again instruct our leaders to work for any changes that will enable the United Nations to become a cooperative body of independent nations each with its own political ideology, as long as that ideology does not entail aggression against its neighbors.

We believe that this objective can be obtained.

Thank you, sirs, for giving the veterans of Colorado an opportunity of expressing our opinions before you today.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. One question.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield.

U. N. POLICE FORCE DEBATED

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Becker, I note that one of the amendments that you oppose has to do with establishing an involuntary world military force. Would you feel more kindly toward the establishment of a voluntary police force in the United Nations if at the same time the member nations kept their own respective military establishments?

Mr. BECKER. I believe that that would be the consensus of opinion of the national organization: yes, sir.

It was discussed at several different times, and it seems to me that we are in favor of a world military force, as I understand it, but that we are against it being compelled, that is, any country being compelled to furnish a military force to uphold the policies of the United Nations.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Becker.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Mr. BECKER. Thank you, gentlemen.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Becker is as follows:)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY ED BECKER, DEPARTMENT OF COLORADO, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

The following statement is submitted by Ed Becker, of John S. Stewart Post, No. 1, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the founding post of the VFW, appearing before the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee at its hearing in Denver, Colo., as the representative of Robert F. Shamburg, of Burlington, Colo., department commander of the Department of Colorado, Veterans of Foreign Wars, to express the opinion of the VFW in Colorado and what the VFW believes to be the opinion of the vast majority of the citizens of the State of Colorado.

The VFW, composed of veterans, who have served the call of their country overseas, has been actively opposed, from the inception of the United Nations, to the movement sponsored by internationalist groups within our country to expand the United Nations into a world government. It can be said that the VFW has forcibly called to the attention of citizens of our country the danger of submitting our precious American sovereignty to the control of a community of nations, many of whom have political and economic philosophies directly opposed to our American way of life. Through the efforts of the VFW at the national and local levels, the citizens of our country are aware of, and vitally opposed to, action that will strengthen the United Nations at the expense of our national sovereignty and curtailing of our rights under the Constitution.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars here in Colorado wholeheartedly, earnestly, and unanimously supported and endorsed Resolution No. 92, approved by the 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Philadelphia, Pa., August 1-6, 1954, which reads in part as follows:

"Be it resolved, by the 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the following recommendations in reference to

the United Nations be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States and to the attention of the United States delegation to the United Nations:

"(1) That the burden of financing the operations and functions of the United Nations be more equally distributed among the participating countries on the basis of their present economic resources which have been greatly rejuvenated since the close of World War II.

"(2) That all other participating countries be required to accept a greater share of these operating costs in a way that will substantially reduce the tremendous burden of costs the United States has been forced to absorb ever since the United Nations was founded.

"(3) That the charter of the United Nations should be amended in a way that will deny countries the opportunity to obstruct and defeat the fundamental aims of the United Nations.

"(4) That the charter of the United Nations should be amended in a way that will henceforth require of all member nations equal sacrifices, both in money and manpower in proportion to their respective resources, when the United Nations votes to resist aggression in any part of the world."

This hearing is scheduled in Denver, Colo., today to consider revisions to the charter of the United Nations. We oppose any amendments to the United Nations Charter that will:

- (1) Alter the veto power.
- (2) Impose world law upon members of the United Nations.
- (3) Give the United Nations the power to tax.
- (4) Establish an involuntary world military force.
- (5) Contravene in the slightest the rights of American citizenship, guaranteed by our Bill of Rights.

Much has been said, and it is readily apparent, that Russia has abused, in the extreme, the use of the veto power. But should this be a valid reason to abolish the veto power? In the opinion of the VFW, the idea of the veto was a sound one when the U. N. was established, and the reasons for the veto have lost none of their validity insofar as the United States is concerned. Should the United States give up its veto power in current matters such as: the admission of Red China into the U. N.; the admission of any other new member into the U. N.; or any international plan for international control and inspection of atomic facilities and weapons?

The answer is emphatically "No." If the veto power is abused, it is no logical answer to abolish it. Rather, it is for all nations to use their best efforts to insure, by persuasion, a more enlightened use of the veto power for the good of all mankind.

The Constitution of the United States would have to be amended to abolish this veto power and when this is done, the sovereignty, for which our revolutionary forefathers fought and died, would be reduced, perhaps more accurately stated, completely destroyed. To such devastation of the cornerstone of the greatest document in the history of man, for the government of men, the VFW is unalterably opposed.

Likewise, we are opposed to a code of world law administered through international courts by judges who are unfamiliar, unaccustomed, and often antagonistic to the freedom guaranteed us under our Constitution. It is inconceivable to me that we should submit our lives to judges who believe in no God; who do not know, or who have no concept of, the basic protection of due process of law. Until such time, far beyond the life of any man today, when education and many years of good will among men, have altered this situation, we of the VFW oppose any amendment to the U. N. Charter which would establish international courts enforcing world law.

Similarly we oppose any amendment which would create in the U. N. a power to tax. No other one factor was as important in bringing about our own Revolutionary War than the abuse of this taxing power. In our opinion, opposition to such a proposal would be almost universal among our citizens.

The success with which the NATO countries have provided an Army, Navy, and Air Force in the European countries best shows the undesirability of a compulsory world military force. Voluntary cooperation in the face of common peril will succeed much more than any compulsory conscription for an international police force. At this stage in world affairs, to add as an adjunct to an international police force the thought that the United States would be required to give up its independent Armed Forces, would be certain suicide. We of the VFW in Colorado, therefore, strongly oppose any compulsory world police force that involves the disarmament of the United States through the abolition of our Armed Forces.

Lastly, we are opposed to any action by the U. N. which would abridge, in any way, the rights and freedoms which we, as American citizens, enjoy and which rights and freedoms have given us the greatest civilization in the history of the world.

The U. N., organized under the stress and compromise of a global conflict, has many imperfections. We of the VFW recognize these imperfections and yet realize the vast good that has been done and can be done under its charter to foster understanding and good will among the nations of the world. But amendments to the charter, which encroach upon the sovereignty of the United States and the rights and freedoms of its citizens, can only lead to the destruction of our way of life. Therefore, we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars here in Colorado oppose those changes proposed by internationalists which tend to destroy the most perfect form of democracy yet devised by the mind of man. God willing, through the efforts of groups of patriotic citizens, such as the members of the VFW, it shall continue as the light and hope of a free world.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Perkin.

Mr. Good. After Mr. Robert Perkin, the next witness will be Mrs. Abbott S. Pond.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Perkin. Proceed in your own way, sir.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. PERKIN, MEMBER, EXECUTIVE BOARD,
DENVER NEWSPAPER GUILD, LOCAL NO. 74, AMERICAN NEWS-
PAPER GUILD (CIO)**

Mr. PERKIN. I appear as a member of the executive board of the Denver Newspaper Guild, Local 74, American Newspaper Guild (CIO), 1212 Champa Street, an organization which speaks for the bulk of the working newspapermen of the West's major city.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee. Our principal purpose in desiring to appear before you is to affirm, simply and directly and for the record, our strong conviction in the efficacy of the United Nations as a means to an orderly and peaceful world, our firm faith in the ideals it represents and our earnest desire that its purposes be pursued with every proper diligence.

We believe solutions to the problems of the world are political and economic and not military. We see in the United Nations the only hope of moving in the direction of those solutions.

We feel it would be improper for us, lacking expert or intimate knowledge, to recommend specific proposals for review of the United Nations Charter. Briefly, our position is this: If opening the charter to review in the present climate of East-West hostility would in any way endanger rather than strengthen this vital document, such review should be postponed. We fully subscribe, however, to the principle that the charter should be subject to the possibility of review at 5 to 10-year intervals.

TOWARD WORLD DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

We believe that, if the charter is to be reviewed, recommendations for its amendment should be arrived at, so far as is possible, by elected representatives of the people. In the United States, we believe such recommendations should come through the Congress.

It is our hope that, on this and other matters, the United Nations will move steadily out of the field of diplomacy and into the broader realm

of world democratic government. We believe delegates to the United Nations should be elected.

We would wish that the United Nations continue to press for nuclear weapons control. We see basic good arising from the technical assistance program, and would hope that it may be expanded. We believe it would be both logical and progressive if control of international passports were placed with the United Nations so that travelers might freely take their ways as citizens of the world.

We regard independent national sovereignty as increasingly a myth, and we aspire toward the wisdom which will permit us, and all other peoples, to understand that love of one's own country need not entail nonlove of another man's country.

Thank you.

FEASIBILITY OF WORLD DEMOCRACY WITH COMMUNIST STATES

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes, I would like to explore with you a couple of your paragraphs here.

Speaking of world democratic government, the Communist world today uses in its satellites such titles as the "People's Democracies" of Poland. They are neither run by the people nor are they democracies. The same situation applies in some others. Do you assume or do you not that the Communist system is not a democratic form of government?

Mr. PERKIN. Oh, very definitely I do assume that.

Senator KNOWLAND. That it is not?

Mr. PERKIN. That it is not.

Senator KNOWLAND. If you were to have any broader concept of world organization you could not under those circumstances include the Communist system within it?

Mr. PERKIN. Not as presently constituted, I don't suppose. Senator, I don't think there is any immediate answer that I could give to that sort of question. I think time has to take care of part of that, but we would be interested in seeing us move in that direction.

Senator KNOWLAND. The reason I raised the question is not to be argumentative about it, because at San Francisco and other places this question has come out. Sometimes people have compared the United Nations Charter with the Constitution of the United States. Sometimes they compared perhaps the present charter to our Articles of Confederacy and spoke of amendments as a looked-forward-to constitutional convention, more or less. Of course, the vast difference between the U. N. and the United States was that not only did our people have a common language, which is not perhaps an insurmountable obstacle, but they also had a common belief in free institutions. Therefore it seemed a little difficult to know how you could enter into such a world organization, including the Communist system, without diluting materially the rights that we have under our Bill of Rights and under our Constitution, and I wanted to clarify that point insofar as your testimony was concerned.

Mr. PERKIN. Surely.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, Senator Mansfield.

ELECTION OF U. N. DELEGATES

Senator MANSFIELD. I am interested in an observation made by you in which you state, "We believe delegates to the United Nations should be elected."

Do you know how the delegates are selected at the present time by their country?

Mr. PERKIN. They are appointive, sir, aren't they?

Senator MANSFIELD. They are appointed, but among the appointees are 2 Members of the House 1 year and 2 Members of the Senate the next year. So you do in that fashion at least get a certain amount of elective representation. Then, of course, the third one is the permanent representative, the Ambassador in this case, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. The other two are appointed, but we do have a certain number of elected officials serving. I bring that out only because this is the first time I have seen anyone make that suggestion, although the chairman tells me that a similar suggestion was made at San Francisco last Saturday.

Mr. PERKIN. Yes. Our position is that we feel that they should be more directly elected by the people and accountable to the people.

Senator MANSFIELD. I see. Thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Perkin.

Mrs. Pond.

Mr. Good. After Mrs. Pond, the next witness will be Mrs. Lacy Wilkinson.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mrs. Pond.

Mrs. POND. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ABBOTT S. POND, WYOMING STATE CHAIRMAN, FOR AMERICA, UNITED STATES FLAG COMMITTEE, AND WE, THE PEOPLE

Mrs. POND. Mr. Chairman, I am Mrs. Abbott Pond of Basin, Wyo., housewife. I am a member of the National Police Committee and Wyoming State chairman of For America, and speak officially for that organization; also for the United States Flag Committee and We, The People, for both of which organizations I am Wyoming State chairman.

I would like to thank the local Denver committee for the courtesy extended to me as an out-of-stater to appear here in this tightly scheduled hearing.

I have discarded the notes from which I was prepared to speak this afternoon; they were the opening and closing of my written statement.

Instead, for at least a part of it, I will use at least a part of the very brief time allotted me to answer Senator Mansfield's remarks of yesterday, quoted in this morning's Rocky Mountain News.

The groups of ardent American patriots who are working in opposition to the well-heeled plans to replace the Stars and Stripes with the banner of the Poison Ivy Wreath are not a rash of anything; neither are we disorganized. Our membership grows rapidly. We are free, independent, working in the American way for the good

of America, which we place above the good of Communists, Hottentots, or anyone else. And we deeply resent the gratuitous insult.

In the Harlan hearings, Maj. George Racey Jordan represented the American Coalition, of which I am a member, and entered in the record a list of more than 100 patriotic organizations that belong to it.

If we were kept as well advised of these hearings as the one-worlders and left-wingers are, perhaps the Senator would hear from more of us. A Mr. Korb, who spoke in the Milwaukee hearing, said that his remarks probably were useless, as all that was likely to eventuate from the hearings would be a count of noses. He was assured that there would be no count of noses; apparently he was misinformed, and there must have been, in order for Senator Mansfield to arrive at his figure of 90 percent of parity with his personal views.

We do not have the slick organization of the dictatorship-bound. Neither do we have the assistance of foundations endowed with money garnered from an economic system that they are working to destroy; nor yet the assistance of the State Department.

CRITICISM OF THE U. N.

Perhaps the Senator can tell us why we should surrender control of our Army to an alien-dominated organization dedicated to the subversion and ruination of this Nation. The brainwashed never wonder but we do.

And why should we turn over control of our Navy to that same organ of American subversion? And why should we turn over control of our Air Force to our own destruction?

And possibly the Senator can tell us how the Southern States would like, under the "rights of passage" clause, to have a few Russian divisions followed, perhaps, by a few from Liberia, marching through Georgia. The brainwashed never wonder, but we do.

And why should we make our courts subject to an international court of justice? And why should our troops abroad be deprived of their constitutional rights? And why should we have agreed that the eyes of our Air Force can be put out by the arrest of our officers and navigators? The brainwashed never wonder, but we do, exceedingly.

And why should we be trying to educate 2 million illiterates the world over when we are short more than 100,000 classrooms in our own country for our own children? And why should UNESCO be re-writing our textbooks to eliminate patriotism and teach the subversive doctrine of allegiance to a foreign-dominated world power? The brainwashed never wonder, but we do.

Why should we turn over the taxing power or any least part of it to a world tyranny? We know that the power to tax is the power to destroy. And why should we bear 70 percent of the costs of all the international agencies for intermeddling in international monkey-shines?

And why should we have FAO to meddle with agriculture, fisheries, and forestry; why should we have ILO to meddle with labor; why should we have WHO to meddle with health and let socialized medicine in by the back door? The brainwashed never wonder, but we are curious.

Why should we have BANK to help move American capital out of this country, create unemployment and commit us to undisclosed contingent liabilities? The brainwashed never wonder, but we do.

Then there is FUND to monkey with the currency and exchange, ITU to meddle with our communications, UPU to take over the postal union, WMO to gather worldwide weather information for the enemy, ICAO to get all of our civil-aeronautics data, IMCO to destroy our merchant marine, ITO to sabotage our industries by destroying the tariffs, with the help of GATT. The brainwashed never wonder about these, but we do. And TAA and TAB to meddle in everything not otherwise classified, and, of course, the Atomic Energy Commission to give the enemy the rest of our atomic know-how.

We wonder why, in fact, we should sacrifice any of the attributes of our national sovereignty in order that our beloved free America may be swallowed up in the giant maw of a world government and a tyranny unknown to the recorded history of mankind. The brainwashed never wonder, but we do.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions? I must ask the audience to observe the rule that I announced in the beginning: No demonstration of any kind at any time.

This is the third time I have made that request, and I most respectfully ask you to abide by it.

Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. I have no questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Pond.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Pond is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. ABBOTT S. POND, BASIN, WYO., REPRESENTING FOR AMERICA

I am Mrs. Abbott S. Pond, of Basin, Wyo., housewife. I am a member of the national policy committee and Wyoming State chairman of For America; I speak officially for that organization.

Had enough people read Mein Kampf, the world would have been spared the bloodbath and the tears; the toil and the sweat of World War II.

Had enough people read the United Nations Charter and its boldly published program for the communization and subjugation of the world, we would have been spared those same tragedies in the Korean war.

If enough people will read the United Nations Charter and its satellite documents even at this late day and hour perhaps, by God's infinite mercy, we may be spared the unimaginable horrors of world war III.

These evil documents, conceived by evil men in the infamy of Yalta and born in the iniquity of San Francisco, contain every provision necessary for the subjugation of the entire world under a tyranny unknown in recorded history; and as our immediate concern here today, for the total destruction of the American form of government, economic system and way of life, and the sovereign independence of the Nation.

Our enemy and his designs are known; it is sheerest folly to suppose he will meet with us sincerely to plan his defeat. The Chinese have a word for it: "You cannot negotiate with the tiger for his hide."

The guns of the enemy with whom we theoretically are joined for peace will not fire from our side, but into it; with the greater precision because under this preposterous agreement, we give him our military plans even while his spies infest our land, and surround control of our Army, Navy, and Air Force and rights of passage through our country.

We must get out of this fiendish trap. We vie with Britain's boast that the sun never sets on her Empire. In military cemeteries around the world, the sun never sets on the empire of our dead. We vie, but we do not boast.

This charter must be amended realistically to—

First: Eliminate interference of whatever nature, under whatever guise, with the internal affairs of any nation, its culture, mode, or standard of living, political, judicial, and military affairs. This requires the dissolution of the specialized agencies through which much of this meddling is accomplished;

Second: Eliminate all judicial powers;

Third: Eliminate all military powers and cession to the Organization of any armed forces whatsoever, or its possession of them. This requires the deletion of chapter VII of the charter.

Fourth: Limit membership to nations whose domestic and international policies and conduct demonstrate beyond doubt their genuine devotion to peace; and

Fifth: Directly to our purpose here considered today, eliminate every threat to America in the sanctity of the principles of her Republic, her economy, industry, and solvency, and above all, her sovereign independence.

In accordance with this purpose, for America has at the present time in preparation, a complete plan of charter revision. As it is our earnest desire to cooperate as fully as possible with the subcommittee, we are submitting herewith certain of those revisions as they presently exist in preliminary draft form. Just as soon as the work has been completed, the recommendations in final form will be submitted to the subcommittee. A selection of the revisions necessary to protect America from the United Nations chartered blueprint for perpetual war for perpetual peace follows:

I. THE PREAMBLE

The opening should be revised to read:

"We, the sovereign powers which are or may become parties to the ensuing charter, have determined, with the help of Almighty God"

Commentary

The so-called preamble opens with a fallacy—there are no such people as the "Peoples of the United Nations"; we are the peoples of our several sovereign nations. This correction is vital, not only in the interest of accuracy, but as will appear in connection with other changes, in order to combat the subtle subversion of words whereby the minds of our citizens, and particularly our schoolchildren, have become confused.

The added phrase requires no explanation. We are a nation founded on a religious concept, conscious of our dependence on a Supreme Being. Such dependence is acknowledged by moral, law-abiding people the world over, and it is only with such that we can join to any good and effective purpose.

Paragraph 1 should be revised to read: "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which three times in our lifetime has engulfed mankind in untold sorrow and sacrifice"

The paragraph in its original form ignores the Korean war and our tragic sacrifices therein; an insult to our dead and their bereaved ones, and those still hidden behind hospital walls who suffer worse than death.

Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4: These should be deleted.

They are mouthings of bombastic platitudes which, in the case of paragraphs 3 and 4 are demonstrably incapable of being effectuated by any outside agency or organization, and already have given rise to many expensive and highly undesirable involvements.

Paragraph 5 should be amended to read: "and to this and to practice tolerance, refrain from interference with the affairs of one another, and to live together in peace."

Commentary

The phrase "as good neighbors" is superfluous and in relation to its subject matter relatively meaningless. The added phrase "refrain from interference with the affairs of one another" is the very basis and essence of peace, and in the light of the experience of the past 10 years, it is of paramount importance that it be clearly stated.

Paragraphs 6, 7, and 8: These should be deleted.

We cannot "unite our strength" except militarily, and that has proven a ghastly farce; we can "insure" nothing, except under an iron-fisted tyranny, which we do not propose to establish, and the "international machinery" for intermeddling is one of the evils of the present charter which must be abolished if America is to survive and the world to have peace.

Conclusion should be amended to read: "For the advancement of this purpose we have, as sovereign nations, consented together to become parties to this revised charter of the United Nations Organization, a voluntary association having such functions and powers as are expressly granted to it by the following articles."

Commentary

The concluding paragraph obviously must be brought into alinement with any revised version, and for our purposes, the national sovereignty of the contracting parties emphasized, along with a statement, for purposes as they will appear later, of the voluntary character of the association.

ARTICLE I

This article should be revised in its entirety to read:

"The purposes and principles of the United Nations are: To provide a focal point of mediation, arbitration, and conciliation among sovereign nations as a means of furthering international peace and security in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."

Commentary

Again it is necessary to eliminate extraneous verbiage and undertakings not only extraneous but actually inimical to the ultimate achievement of peace, as well as those manifestly incapable of accomplishment.

ARTICLE II

Paragraph 2: The concluding phrase should be amended to read: "* * * shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with this present revised charter."

Commentary

The inclusion of the word "revised" is a self-evident correction in the circumstances.

Paragraph 3: Should be amended to read: "All members shall endeavor sincerely to settle * * *"

Again, we cannot use the imperative "shall" where it is unenforcible.

Paragraphs 4, 5, and 6: These should be deleted.

Commentary

Paragraph 4 is unenforcible and therefore irrelevant; paragraph 5 becomes superfluous under the contemplated revisions.

Paragraph 6 is probably the most arrogant assumption of power ever put into words by mankind. It is a plain announcement of intent to rule the world; vicious and preposterous as a statement of purpose; far more so as a basis of action.

Paragraph 7: This should be revised to read:

"Nothing contained in the present charter ever shall authorize the United Nations Organization to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any nation, whether or not they are so defined in its organic law; nor shall require the members to submit such matters to intervention, arbitration, or settlement."

Commentary

The exception of chapter VII, in the original form of this paragraph, for all practical purposes invalidates it. This has been deleted, and the language of the portion retained has been clarified and strengthened.

Paragraph 8 (new): "No agreement, convention, covenant, declaration, recommendation, resolution, or treaty made hereunder shall contravene the organic law of the several member nations, nor authorize the United Nations Organization to exercise any authority with respect to matters essentially domestic in character, nor require the members to submit such matters to intervention, arbitration, or settlement."

Commentary

This elaborates and carries over into subsidiary agreements the principles of paragraph 7.

Paragraph 9 (new): "The enumeration in the charter of certain functions and powers shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the parties

thereto. All functions and powers not specifically delegated to the United Nations by this instrument, nor prohibited to it thereby, or by the laws of the member nations, are reserved to those nations respectively, or to their peoples, and the United Nations Organization shall exercise no undelegated or doubtful powers, but only those explicitly conveyed herein."

Commentary

This is the very heart and cornerstone of revision, and America's only adequate protection from the insidious expansion of the organization's powers and authority by charter interpretation. Furthermore, the U. N. itself gives us ample warning by way of a handbook, *The United Nations: Action for Peace*, published for the American Association for the United Nations. On page 6, under Paramount Powers, it states, in part:

"The General Assembly has an important power in its right to recommend measures for the peaceful settlement of any situation *regardless of origin*. * * * Under this paramount power IT MAY BE POSSIBLE SOME DAY FOR THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO INTERVENE EVEN IN A DOMESTIC MATTER. * * *" [Emphasis supplied.]

It continues, under LIMITATION OF POWER:

"The *only limitation* on the power of the Assembly is that it may not make any recommendation on a dispute if the Security Council is already dealing with it. However, *even this is not truly a limitation*, for when the Security Council is deadlocked on a particular issue, the *majority* may vote to remove the question from the Council's working schedule so that the Assembly can deal with it. When voting to do this, the SECURITY COUNCIL HAS ESTABLISHED THROUGH PRECEDENT THAT THE VETO DOES NOT APPLY." [Emphasis supplied.]

And on page 7:

"The General Assembly makes the policies. IT IS THE PARLIAMENT OF THE WORLD." [Emphasis supplied.]

What need for further comment when the veto, the only protection we thought we had, apparently has been annulled by precedent?

A further word of warning, however, might be added in that every power given the United Nations Organization under the revised charter must not only be specifically defined as to what it is, but specifically and comprehensively defined as to what it is not. This basic principle, together with the foregoing amendment, consistently applied throughout, would be our greatest safeguard

ARTICLE III

This should be amended to read:

"The original members of the United Nations Organization shall be the sovereign nations which * * *."

The two changes suggested here are basic to clarifying the nature of the entity being created. The word "Organization" always must be included in the designation, and we must get rid of the insidious substitution of the word "State" (or "States") for "Nation" (or "Nations"). While it is true that, by dictionary definition, use of the word "State" is permissible, there is a subtle psychological factor involved. In common usage and construction, and particularly in its connotation in the American mind, "State" implies a subsidiary political subdivision; not a sovereign nation.

The fact that the word "Nation" (except as used in the title "United Nations") is used only 4 times; 3 of them within the first 3 pages; that for the balance "State" is substituted for a total of 34 times in the charter, and that a similar substitution occurs throughout the statute, is definitely by design. It is intended to accustom the peoples of the member nations—in particular the American people—to the idea of the United Nations Organization as the sovereign power; the nations being merely political subdivisions of a world government. The hybrid term "Nation States"—surely a political freak or monstrosity—appears from time to time in the mouthings of the one-worlders. This subtle, poisonous indoctrination must be stopped.

ARTICLE V

Amend by deletion of the phrase "Against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council * * *."

Commentary

As it is proposed to eliminate enforcement powers in their present sense, from the charter, this phrase is inapplicable.

ARTICLE VI

Paragraph 2 (new) : "A member nation may, by giving ninety days' advance notice to the Secretary-General, withdraw from the United Nations Organization, its councils, commissions, or specialized agencies or the International Court of Justice. Withdrawal shall not, however, release such member from performance of specific commitments or contractual obligations incurred for and during the period of its membership in the Organization."

Commentary

While the privilege of withdrawal is inherent in the nature of any voluntary association, for the reasons heretofore stated, it is important that it here be spelled out. A comparable privilege also must exist in the collateral, subsidiary, and affiliate groups and organizations, the long, multiple tentacles of the parent Organization.

ARTICLE VII

Paragraph 1 should be amended to read :

"There are established as the principal organs of the United Nations Organization a General Assembly and a Security Council."

Commentary

The Economic and Social Council must be abolished. It has nothing whatever to do with the establishment or preservation of peace, despite the bombastic and fraudulent claims of the do-gooders. It is the spawning ground for the agencies of intermeddling in international monkeyshines.

The Trusteeship Council, a power grab under an euphonic name, has no reason for existence and must be abolished.

The International Court of Justice, together with its statute, must be abolished. It serves no legitimate purpose that was not provided for before it came into existence. Further, it is a threat to the judicial autonomy of every member nation—even to its very existence—for reasons too lengthy to permit of examination here. Two brief sentences from the statute, however, really should suffice:

Article 36, paragraph 6: "In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled **BY THE DECISION OF THE COURT.**" [Emphasis supplied.] *Thus the Court is the judge of its own jurisdiction.*

Article 60: "The judgment is **FINAL AND WITHOUT APPEAL.**" [Emphasis supplied.]

ARTICLE XIII

Paragraph 1 (a) : Amend by deletion of "in the political field" as being broad, ambiguous, and dangerous.

Paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 2: Amend by deletion. 1 (b) again gets into meddlesome, dangerous undertakings, irrelevant to peace. Paragraph 2 is deleted because chapters IX and X referred to therein are recommended to be deleted in their entirety, for reasons already discussed in a prior connection.

ARTICLE XVI

Amend by deletion, as it refers to chapters XII and XIII which are recommended for deletion in accordance with commentary under article VII.

ARTICLE XVII

Paragraph 2: Amend to read: "The expenses of the Organization and its subsidiary activities shall be borne by the members thereof in proportion to their voting strength in the General Assembly."

Commentary

Redistribution of the financial burden is imperative for both practical and psychological reasons. The equating of power and privilege with responsibility is the only method that is fair and just, and morally and financially sound. We must do away with the present hilarious spending of our money on the Communist

doctrine of "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." The new method would, incidentally, tap Russia for three times as much as it would us.

Paragraph 3 (new) : "The United Nations Organization shall have no power, except that specifically granted in paragraph 2 above in relation to assessments, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, nor to borrow money on its credit or the credit of its member nations; nor to coin money or print currency; nor to establish a value for either.

Commentary

This is in line with the specific delineation of powers as to what they are not. We must recognize that "assessment" as used in the United Nations Organization is taxation, applied to nations rather than individuals. Furthermore, the world government advocates already are demanding "limited" (God save the mark!) taxing powers for the Organization. ITO and GATT undoubtedly look forward with unconfined joy to sooner or later grabbing the customs. UNESCO is issuing scrip convertible into cash, and so far as I have been able to learn, our contingent liabilities under bank, which by rights should be added to our national debt figure, are undisclosed. These are just a few of the dangers already on the horizon which would be covered by the foregoing provision.

ARTICLE XIV

Amend to read :

"Subject to the provisions of article 12, the General Assembly may make recommendations for the peaceable settlement of disputes among its members, but shall have no powers of enforcement."

This eliminates the source of the "paramount powers" clause previously quoted under article II, paragraph 9, as an obvious and necessary deterrent to the perpetual wars which the present charter is bound to produce.

ARTICLE XXII

Amend by deletion, as this again feeds into the paramount powers issue, as well as the spawning of the multitude of specialized agencies, commissions, etc., that meddle in every aspect of life.

CHAPTER VII

Amend by deletion in its entirety. This heinous, incredible sabotaging of our military power beggars belief. Space does not admit of detailed comment except that Congress loses the power to declare war. And under the "rights of passage" clause, how would the Southern States like a few Russian divisions marching through Georgia—followed, perhaps, by a couple of divisions from Liberia?

CHAPTERS IX THROUGH XIV

These chapters also should be deleted in their entirety, for reasons already discussed, and which space does not permit of elaboration.

NEW CHAPTER VII

"The United Nations Organization shall have no powers and make no recommendations whatsoever with respect to migration of persons across national borders."

Commentary

This prohibition is necessary to be spelled out because the eager One-Worlders already are seeking just such a power for the hastening of the destruction of national entities and the merging of the races.

The foregoing amendments are not complete as to the requirements for converting the United Nations organization into an avenue helpful toward peace, rather than a breeder of perpetual wars. Neither are they finalized as to the position of For America, in the items covered, but are offered at this time in their preliminary form as a gesture of cooperation with the subcommittee.

Certain steps become clear—

First: Our American delegates must vote for holding the review conference. The U. S. News & World Report recently stated that President Eisenhower will bring great pressure to bear to prevent it.

Second: We must secure the majorities necessary to assure the conference being held.

Third: Charter revision along the lines above indicated, and annulment of the satellite agreements, including those pertaining to the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council and International Court of Justice.

Fourth: Should the issue fail at any one of points 1, 2, or 3, the United States must forthwith and without delay withdraw from the United Nations organization and all of its works, and see to the speedy removal of the organization and its satellites: agencies, staffs, foreign employees, and operations of any nature whatsoever, from within the boundaries of the continental United States, its territories and possessions.

We were created a God-fearing nation. We have no moral right to sit in the seats of the scornful, nor to partake in the councils of the ungodly.

It has been said that if we fail, it may be 500 years before God gives the mantle to another. It may be much longer.

Let our light again so shine before the world, that the poor will take hope; the slave will take courage; the tired strive again. This, not the vile abomination into which we have been betrayed, is our destiny.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Wilkinson.

Mr. GOOD. After Mrs. Wilkinson, the next witness will be Mr. Cecil Franklin.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Wilkinson, we are glad to have you with us. Proceed in your own way.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. LACY WILKINSON, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN,
GREELEY FEDERATED WOMEN'S CLUBS, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN FOR COLORADO STATE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN**

Mrs. WILKINSON. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Congressman Rogers, and Mayor Newton, as legislative chairman of the Greeley Federated Women's Clubs and legislative chairman for the Colorado Council of Churches, Department of Women, I am submitting the following statement on United Nations Charter review in regard to the veto.

REVIEW OF THE VETO PROVISION SUGGESTED

When the veto power was decided upon at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 it was not anticipated that the power would be used regularly, as it has been by Russia, to prevent Council action in dangerous situations.

In the present United Nations we have had more than sufficient opportunity to observe the injustice and paralyzing effect of an absolute veto by any one nation. This veto in the Security Council seems to be not the cause but the symptoms of international hostility between great powers. The veto in matters relating to war and peace is at this time a good thing and is inevitable under the present circumstances. The fears of all the great powers are lessened by the existence of the veto upon which each can rely if necessary. I regard the veto in certain matters to be indispensable to our national interests under the present charter. Our national interests and security require that we retain the final say on anything involving the use of American forces. This means the right to use the veto.

However, the charter could well be amended to eliminate the veto on two points:

- (a) On the admission of new member nations.
 - (b) On the peaceful means of settling disputes.
- To be specific:

REMOVAL OF VETO ON MEMBERSHIP

(a) On the matter of membership 14 deserving nations, namely, Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, and Vietnam, have been blocked from admission to the United Nations because of Soviet Russia's abuse of the veto in the Security Council.

We ask ourselves this question: "Do we want limited or universal membership?" Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has stated on the question of universality that—

It is useful that there be an organization which is, generally speaking, universal and whose processes run throughout the world. Otherwise the association takes on the character of an alliance.

He also states:

that unless ways can be found to bring peace-loving law-abiding nations into this organization, then inevitably the power and influence of this organization will progressively decline.

No possible avenue to the solution of admitting peace-loving nations should remain unexplored.

It is certainly cause for dismay and regret that no new member has been admitted to the United Nations since Indonesia came into the organization in 1950. There is certainly no dearth for qualified applicants as was pointed out in the case of the 14 above-named nations. These nations have been excluded from the U. N. by 1 member, namely, the U. S. S. R., which has cast its vote 28 times on the membership issue. The Soviet Union has not hesitated to veto the application of states for admission to membership even though it openly admits it is doing so on grounds other than failure to meet the qualifications as set forth in article 4 of the charter. The General Assembly has pointed out time after time that each of the 14 applicants fully meets all qualifications for admission.

From the very birth of the U. N. organization it was always regarded that membership would include all peace-loving states accepting the obligation of the charter and willing to carry them out. In article 4 of the charter certain tests for admission were set forth, and membership was understood to be open to all states meeting these tests. The United States has hoped that all states would qualify for membership both because of the view that the national interests of States makes desirable their participation in the work of the organization, and because of the larger interest of the organization itself in having present in a single forum representatives from every participant in international affairs.

REMOVAL OF VETO FROM PACIFIC SETTLEMENT QUESTIONS

(b) Neither should one nation possess the right to veto pacific settlements of disputes. Oftentimes these settlements have been laboriously arrived at by nations working together in good faith, and then all their efforts have been stymied by one of the big 5 nations in the Security Council. For example, just a year ago in the dispute between Syria

and Israel a veto on the proposed course of settlement favored by the majority of the members of the Security Council was Russia's only contribution. Just 3 months later Russia vetoed Thailand's request for a peace-observer team. Under charter revision on this issue a majority of the nations in the Security Council should be allowed to settle peaceful disputes.

Even though Russia or some other nation may not be willing to see the elimination of the veto from these two areas, it would nevertheless be valuable for the United States to advocate these changes. In view of our status as a great power in the world we should and must take the lead to support certain charter revisions to create a strengthened United Nations. We should explore all possibilities for further action under the present charter and then offer some constructive ideas on charter revision, which will perhaps be acceptable to all members. We cannot conclude that Russia or any other nation will not be willing to go along with charter review until we have put them to the test.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. No, Mr. Chairman.

All I want to say is that I am delighted to see an old friend appear before this committee, and I wish you would give my best to Lacy when you go back to Greeley.

Mrs. WILKINSON. Thank you. I am delighted to see you, Senator Mansfield and Senator Sparkman, and I should say, and Senator Knowland. I beg your pardon. Senator Sparkman and Senator Mansfield have both been in Greeley and visited with us. That is why I included them.

I am also delighted to meet for the first time Senator Knowland
Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Wilkinson, I thought perhaps you might have gotten thrown off balance, as I did. Mike Mansfield referred to you as an old friend.

Mrs. WILKINSON. Thank you. I consider that a compliment.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Franklin.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Franklin, the next witness will be Mr. George Warren.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Franklin. Proceed in your own way, sir.

STATEMENT OF CECIL FRANKLIN, DENVER FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

Mr. FRANKLIN. Thank you. I am speaking in behalf of the Denver Fellowship of Reconciliation.

We feel that the United Nations organization has proved itself to be a useful instrument for reducing international tensions and preserving world peace. It has experienced failures but these are certainly quite as much due to the immensity of the problems as to any defects in the mechanism of the organization.

The Government of the United States ought to approach a conference on charter review in a conservative spirit, not disposed to insist on changes against strong international opposition. At the same time it ought to be abundantly resourceful in suggesting ideas

capable of sparking the imagination of the peoples of the world, and to manifest every evidence of a sincere effort to make this international body more fruitful in the interests of world peace.

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

I. The primary and most urgent concern of the Fellowship of Reconciliation is that provision for pacific settlement of disputes should be implemented in such a way that there might be no occasion for hostilities arising from these disputes.

One of the strongest peaceful forces for accomplishing this end is the power of world public opinion, which has on occasion had very salutary effects on national policies. Two measures may be useful in augmenting this power. One is an increase in publicity by the United Nations of itself and its activities. The other is a clear definition in the charter of terms, whose ambiguity might leave room for such variant interpretations that world peace would be threatened. This includes such words as "aggression," "domestic," and "international."

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

II. The problem of membership in the U. N. is one which is of very great and universally recognized importance. We feel that the proper goal is universality. Membership of a nation in the organization is of importance to the community of nations, as well as to the nation itself. One of the functions of the U. N. is to provide a forum for expression of opinions and grievances. This might sometimes provide an outlet for feeling which would otherwise use the channel of military aggression. Furthermore, irresponsibility outside the U. N. can menace world peace quite as much as irresponsibility inside it. The U. N. is an instrument for the conciliation of nations. Ostracism is not consistent with this goal.

If universal membership is not immediately attainable, consideration ought to be given to progressive measures looking toward that end, such as schemes for associate membership.

MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

III. The problems involving the Security Council are among the knottiest that can be considered. Apparently it must be controlled by the largest and most influential nations. It might be of value to give more recognition to the place of the Republic of India as a leader of those nations which are not irrevocably committed in the cold war. This bloc might be capable of acting as a mediator to prevent a direct clash between the two greater coalitions.

The veto must be retained in some form. We must never lose sight of the fact that the most useful purpose which the U. N. can fulfill in our generation is the prevention of full-scale military hostilities between the two great armed camps. A complete diplomatic defeat of either camp could set off world war III.

There may, however, be some value in separating the veto from the simple negative vote. This would make it a more conspicuous instrument and might in some cases tend to limit its applications.

THE COURT AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

IV. We urge that consideration be given to measures designed to broaden and strengthen the jurisdiction of the World Court, feeling that every step in this direction will bring international relations closer to the rule of law and justice.

V. We favor an expansion of the activities of the specialized agencies, whose accomplishments, though quiet and sometimes publicized less than they merit, rank among the most outstanding of the U. N.'s achievements to date. The positive and creative work of these agencies provides one of the best vehicles for cooperation among nations for common goals. We feel that it is through this approach that we are most likely to break down the current distrust which is the primary cause of high armaments. A sizable investment in these activities for constructive work might pay high dividends by making the reduction of armaments more probable at a future time.

The conference on charter review certainly must not become a sounding-board for antagonistic propaganda in the power struggle. No complete victory in the power struggle is possible in the foreseeable future without general war, and that would issue in the most pyrrhic of victories. Yet this is a legitimate forum for American peace-loving idealism to express itself and to seek to implement its aims with effective international tools. Proposals unlikely of immediate adoption ought not to be avoided, for they could sow the seeds which, after germinating in the minds and imaginations of the peoples of the world, might ultimately bear the fruits of a lasting peace.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSED

Senator KNOWLAND. I have a couple of questions on this universal membership which you are advocating.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland.

Senator KNOWLAND. That matter was subject to discussion 10 years ago in San Francisco, and the decision was made that the membership should be based on the assumption of certain obligations and a willingness to live up to them.

Now, would you advocate the admission of members who are not prepared to live up to the terms of the United Nations Charter and its obligations?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Well, I think that has to be considered on the basis of what you might call a calculated risk. I don't say that universality of membership is possible now or that it is absolutely advisable right now. I think that is the direction in which we should move.

The calculated risk would be whether it seems that world peace would be more likely to be preserved by admitting them or refusing them admission, and that would have to be calculated by diplomatic persons who are in a position to have the knowledge that would be most relevant to the question.

Senator KNOWLAND. We are trying to get some specific recommendations, because somewhere along the line before the American Government's position is finalized, we are going to have to determine whether we will make specific recommendations or whether we will stand on the present charter.

SUSPENSION AND EXPULSION

I am merely trying to explore here a little what I think is a very important question. Now, either a member is admitted with the obligation to live up to the charter or is admitted with the general recognition that it has no obligation of living up to the charter. You have the same situation with a nation which is already a member. Would you permit it to continue its membership if, for instance, it becomes an aggressor, or if not becoming a direct aggressor itself, if it supported an aggressor contrary to the charter? Have you given any thought to the expulsion of members who do not live up to the charter or to the resolutions passed by the organization?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Well, I think there might be some devices worked out possibly for suspension in the hope that world opinion would cause the nation to amend its ways, so to speak.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Senator KNOWLAND. Don't you recognize that there is a considerable problem behind the Iron Curtain, in that the people there may never learn what world opinion is outside of the curtain with the complete control of radio and press and other means of communication?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Yes. I think there is probably some evidence that non-Communist opinion has on occasion influenced actions of Communist nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. We have had before us on the Appropriations Committee testimony that the Soviet Union is spending perhaps as much in blocking the broadcasts of Voice of America as we are spending in trying to get word behind the Iron Curtain. But it would seem to me—and I would like to have your views on it—that a nation which accepts membership in the U. N. should have some obligation to permit the debates and discussions to get to the people of that nation. And it should not be necessary for us, as an individual member of the United Nations, to broadcast them by Voice of America. They should be required to furnish to their people at least as much as we furnish to the people of the free world on the debates and discussions.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I certainly think that that is a goal worth working toward, freedom of communications in general, on other matters as well as this. Whether there is any way of accomplishing this soon and in an enforceable manner, I don't see ways.

Senator KNOWLAND. Couldn't that be made as a condition of membership?

Mr. FRANKLIN. That would be a calculated risk. My own tendency would be not to risk quite that much.

Senator KNOWLAND. All right.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield.

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Warren, the next witness will be Mr. Louis Larin.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE WARREN, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. WARREN. My name is George Warren. I live at 3020 Chase Street, employed by a local moving and storage company. My interest is in withdrawal, not amendments.

REASONS FOR ADVOCATING U. S. WITHDRAWAL

Some reasons why I believe that the United States should discontinue its participation in the United Nations:

The fact that they have been able to enroll under the United Nations banner college presidents, lawyers, preachers, and newspaper editors, does not, in my opinion, change its complexion in the least.

In the first place, how can anyone really believe that a thing which Communists, atheists, and internationalists helped create could be in the best interests of this country, when these three—atheism, communism, and internationalism—are by their very nature diametrically opposite of the Christian and patriotic principles upon which our Republic was founded?

Now, they doomed their project to failure from the very beginning because they failed to invoke upon it the blessing of God. I believe that the history of men and nations will vindicate the contention that when Almighty God is left out they may just as well write "Ichabod" over the door.

With regard to Korea, while this was called a "United Nations action," the fact remains that the United States supplied nearly all of the fighting men and materials. Our good comrade, India, who did more of the talking than anyone else, sent, I believe, one ambulance.

Our commanders from that theater have testified to substantially the same thing, that orders from higher up handicapped them in their prosecution of the war and virtually forbade their gaining a military decision in the field.

In connection with this, it might be well to remember that during the period of the Korean conflict the United Nations post of Minister of War, Communications, and Information, was held by a Moscow Communist, Mr. Arkady A. Sobolev. Now, gentlemen, isn't that a rather strange way to win a war, having an enemy in a position to pass on your intelligence and communications? And, if I am not mistaken, this position was allotted permanently to the Russians.

UNESCO CRITICIZED

Another reason why I think we should kill the old serpent, is to destroy some of its little ones. The UNESCO, for example—United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization—a high-sounding title. But let's see what its functions are: One of its chief projects seems to be the indoctrination of our youth in the one-world ideology. According to the UNESCO thinking it is important that our kids be taught to hold in holy reverence such distant peoples and lands as India, Albania, or Ireland, united, of course, in a world government; but to teach our youth loyalty and devotion to our own country and flag—well, that is considered dangerous. They might possibly develop into reactionaries or super patriots.

I believe that great statesman and patriot from the State of Indiana, Senator William E. Jenner, put it quite aptly when he described the U. N. Charter as a machinegun that looks like a baby carriage.

I will say in conclusion, that I have not acquired these views altogether from reading history books. For 57 months, during the World War II period, I was in the United States Army Infantry. Two years of this period was spent overseas, and like soldiers of all previous American wars, we did not, neither were we expected to serve under or pledge allegiance to any flag except the Star Spangled Banner. I have two small sons, and if when they have attained military age, they are called to go and help defend their country against its enemies, I pray that they, like their daddy before them shall go under our Stars and Stripes, and not under a Christless United Nations spider web.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator SPARKMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, before the next witness gets on, I am getting a little tired, and wonder if you are. Would you like to get up and stretch a little bit. Suppose we do that.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During this brief moment, let me make a couple of announcements to you. First of all, I would like to present some of the people who are helping us. Some of them have come from Washington with us: Mr. Carl Marcy over here, who is a member of the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The same applies to Mr. Valeo here at the end of the table. Mr. Williams, our reporter, comes from Washington.

We have some good help from some of our local people. Mr. Robert Good has been calling off the witnesses as they have appeared, and also has been of great help in setting up this meeting. Mr. David Toll has been of great assistance in helping to make arrangements: Miss Ruth Davis has been a secretarial assistant and is the young lady that has been distributing these statements from time to time. Mrs. Luellen Moore is the timekeeper who calls all of these people to a halt.

Thank you very much. Be seated and we will take the next witness.

I may add that a number of persons have submitted statements for the record, rather than to appear personally. They will be offered at this time.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

APRIL 7, 1955.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS,
United States Senate.

GENTLEMEN: The Steele Center UNESCO Group feels that because of present world climate, charter revision at this time does not seem feasible. There is a danger of weakening instead of strengthening the United Nations at this point. We feel it would be wiser to continue to strengthen the General Assembly through broader interpretation and added flexibility of the charter.

We suggest keeping the following points in mind—

1. That the Ad Hoc Membership Committee of the General Assembly continue to pursue the present problems of membership.

2. That a long-range goal of universality of membership be considered.

The Steele Center UNESCO Group would also like to make these further suggestions for consideration by the elected representatives of our Government:

1. That a positive program of education about the United Nations be carried on within the United States to help improve the climate of understanding about the United Nations and its work.

2. That we restore and/or increase our appropriation to the technical assistance program and to the specialized agencies.

3. We heartily approve and recommend the bringing to the attention of the United Nations such matters as the atomic energy program and the prisoners-of-war issue as presented by President Eisenhower. Such actions are beneficial both to the United Nations and the citizens of our own country.

We extend to you our commendation for the time and effort your committee have expended on the consideration of the particular problem of charter review.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ROLLAND W. HOOPS,
President for the Steele Center UNESCO Group.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. ANDERSON, GOLDEN, COLO., ON HOW TO HAVE AN EFFECTIVE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is a very theoretical organization; it is not a workable body. It is not a practical international parliament, because it doesn't take its own professed aims seriously. According to its charter the purpose was to set up an organization of peace-loving nations. By what logic, then, was militaristic and imperialistic Soviet Russia admitted to membership?

The reasoning was pragmatic, opportunistic. If we consult the Yalta papers of Charles Bohlen we find under the subject, World Security Organization, this illuminating statement: "He (Prime Minister Churchill) said that in the last resort would peace depended on the friendship and cooperation of the three governments, but that the British Government would consider that they were committing an injustice if reservation were not made for free statements of their grievances by small countries." Further along we read this: "He added that because of our great power, which is still protected by the veto if we do not agree, we should allow others to be heard."

Therefore the U. N. is essentially only a debating society. It is powerless to do the job it was designed to do, repel aggression, because it was conceived in a spirit of cold calculation. Pledged to secure the rule of law in international society, it violated that pledge and played power politics from the very beginning.

The authors of the U. N., the Big Three, should have been the Big Four, but China was excluded. Having decided to establish a peace organization called the United Nations, the Big Three saw to it that the U. N. had nothing to say about the peace settlements after World War II. To the victor belonged the spoils; Russia was permitted to loot Germany and Austria to her heart's content. Not only should the U. N. have been a forum for the discussion and settlement of immediate postwar problems, but small nations should have been invited to make themselves heard. Their representatives could be disinterested and analyze issues with cool heads. Small nations should have been equal to the Big Three; then they would have outvoted Russia and contributed enormously to the pacification of the world.

But this was deemed inexpedient by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin. With the result that the U. N. was soon faced with aggression but could not repel it and had to agree to the communization of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Esthonia, Korea (North), Hungary, Kurile Islands, Latvia, Lithuania, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Tibet and Vietnam (North).

The U. N. has repeatedly ignored the rightful claims of small nations because of power politics. Take the Moroccan trouble in 1953. France met a rebellion in Morocco by deposing the Sultan and putting a yes-man in his place. Fifteen countries asked the U. N. to consider the protests of Morocco. The Security Council refused. Expediently, the United States took the side of France against Morocco. But when Iran confiscated British oil wells, Great Britain got the U. N. to order Mossadegh, Iran's Prime Minister, to hasten to New York and explain his actions to the U. N.

Power politics falsifies the supposed juridic principles of the U. N. in many other instances. Shocking examples are the following countries, all qualified for admittance to the U. N. but refused admittance: Japan, Italy, South Korea,

Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Austria, Ceylon, Nepal, Jordan, Libya, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, West Germany. Who keeps them out of the U. N.? Russia. How? By the veto votes of herself and her allies. Due to the expediency of the U. N., the Soviet bloc with its five votes can thwart the will not only of the above-named countries but also of the other U. N. nations, 60 members.

The time has come to renew or amend the charter of the U. N. Can our Congress now insist upon basic changes in the charter? No. Any proposed changes will be vetoed by our Russian friends.

Those who lust for authority over others, those who want absolute authority over all the peoples of the earth, can frustrate all our efforts to establish a world order based upon international law. They can defy us publicly through their spokesmen in the U. N., conscienceless characters such as Vyshinsky, Malik, and Gromyko. We are powerless to act effectively in defense of our own interests and those of the free world.

A chaotic international situation such as this, in which there is no world body that can act decisively to repel aggressors, leaves mankind at the mercy of the nuclear destructionists in the event of a shooting war and at the mercy of the U. S. S. R. in the cold war. What can we do about it?

Either we must reform the U. N. or withdraw from it and offer the free world our leadership in setting up a genuine United Nations organization in place of the present fake assembly. In either case we must correct our fundamental error, namely, our positivistic, opportunistic approach to the problem of world peace.

The reformed U. N., or its corrected successor, must be an organization operating in accordance with sound, universally valid moral principles rather than expediency. It must take the drastic, all-important step of recognizing the Author of the moral law, God. God has been ignored by the U. N. in accordance with its principles of expediency in order to placate the Marxian atheists. Reject God and you reject morality for all practical purposes; the voice of expediency decides for you what is right and what is wrong.

William Penn stated that "Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants." The sad history of the U. N. fully vindicates this judgment. The Big Three were not genuinely interested in right governmental conduct because expediency governed all the thinking of their leaders. A fatal error. Since the Communists are diabolically clever at exploiting the idealism, the longing for peace and brotherhood of mankind, they have made a mockery of the U. N. Every year expediency forces the U. N. to allow more millions of helpless people to become the slaves of the Marxian tyrants.

STATEMENT OF CARL S. HOMSHER, DENVER, COLO., ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

I contacted Mr. Robert Good, who was appointed by Mayor Newton to make arrangements for the public hearing on the United Nations' Charter by the Senate subcommittee on April 11, in Phipps Auditorium, relative to presenting my plan to establish permanent world peace, but owing to all written materials and testimony to be incorporated in the records of the subcommittee being limited to approximately 10 to 12 typewritten pages I cannot submit my plan, for it includes practically every subject that should be in the charter and clarifies same, and it is too long, so I will mail it direct to the Secretary General of the United Nations to be presented to the 10th anniversary session of the United Nations on June 20 next.

A real world government by law and not treaty and universal disarmament is the only solution to establish world peace. The world government must have its own police forces, by continents, with the power to levy and collect taxes, to pay its debts, to provide for its police forces, to arbitrate disputes, to make and enforce decisions, to enforce universal disarmament, to abolish military conscription, including the world government, and to enforce all other provisions of the United Nations' Charter, so as to preserve order and establish world peace between nations.

To give the people of all countries their two greatest desires: Security against want and war, it is essential that we have local, national, and international cooperation and planning, and this can only be accomplished through collective security against want and war, for security through military strength would mean that a nation must be as strong as all other nations combined, which would be absurd. An armaments race cannot establish peace, but only makes economic and political problems more acute and war inevitable.

I suggest that such regional organizations as NATO, and the rearming of our former enemies and allies should be only temporary, and not to subordinate the United Nations, but to get other nations to cooperate in establishing a real world government by adopting a revised or rather a new United Nations' Charter, that has been created by taking the best ideas submitted to the United Nations and write a new United Nations' Charter to include all the necessary changes to create a real world government, and refer it to the people of all countries for an international referendum, by each nation voting to approve or reject same. The new United Nations' Charter should prohibit the veto power by any nation; outlaw war, by abolishing the sovereign right of all nations to resort to war to settle disputes; disarm all nations; abolish universal military conscription by all nations, including the world government or U. N.; and make other changes to establish collective security, to eliminate perpetual war, and establish permanent peace, so as to save millions of lives and billions of dollars in armaments and destruction of property annually, that can and should be used to provide the necessities of life and free education and medical care for all to aid humanity instead of destroying it.

It seems to me that many of the present heads of governments and their representatives at the United Nations have a tendency to resist any change in their present political, economic, monetary, military, and social systems and insist on the status quo, so referring the approval of a new United Nations' Charter to the peoples of the world would give a little political freedom to the people or a voice in their government, and put their public officials, sort of on the spot, who talk peace and spend a few million dollars to promote peace, while spending many billions to promote war. Those who do the fighting, suffering, starving, dying, and paying for useless and senseless wars should have a voice in their government to determine their own destiny in the future.

In the machine, airplane, scientific, electronic, atomic, and H-bomb guided missiles, and pushbutton age, coexistence is the only alternative to coannihilation, so let's keep out of war and establish a real world government, with its own police forces, and disarm all nations.

"There are only two victors in war: 'Death and destruction.'"

STATEMENT OF DOLORES KISER, PRESIDENT, COLORADO STATE FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., BOULDER, COLO.

The members of the Colorado State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, join with the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., supporting legislation "within the framework of the United States Constitution to strengthen and make effective the United Nations' Charter."

Upon the recommendation of the United Nations charter review committee of the National Federation which was presented and voted upon at the biennial convention in St. Louis, June 1954, this State federation favors the United States supporting the calling of a conference for the review of the United Nations Charter when the question comes before the General Assembly in 1955.

We are mindful of the specific and interrelated purposes of the charter: the maintenance of "international peace and security" and the promotion of "conditions of stability and well being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations."

Recognizing our responsibility as citizens of the United States and part of the "peoples of the United Nations," we are continuously encouraging, planning, and carrying out programs for well-informed opinions on the problems and achievements of the United Nations in its present structure. Out of this have come the conclusions that the United Nations is an invaluable instrument for furthering the ends of justice and peace; that America can no longer go it alone; that the United Nations is a place where sovereign nations can work earnestly and diligently, though painfully slow, at relating themselves constructively to the world as a whole; that the United Nations is a place where, through discussion and debate, public opinion can be mobilized to achieve peaceful means for the resolving of conflicts which might otherwise result in violence of great proportions. We must further conclude that the United Nations has not been as successful as perhaps many had dreamed; however, we would earnestly urge exceeding care be exercised in any review of its strengths and weaknesses and that the failures be most accurately examined to determine the reasons for them. Is the machinery at fault or is it the wills of the individuals at the conference tables?

We do not feel prepared to make suggestions for specific revisions; we do feel that solid achievements have been made through the United Nations in its present form. Under the present charter, women in many countries have made great progress; through nonpolitical activities, the United Nations and its related agencies have served the cause of peace well. We are extremely zealous that if any changes are made, they will actually and realistically strengthen, rather than impair the present effectiveness.

We agree that "it still represents man's best organized hope to substitute the conference table for the battlefield." We pledge our faith in the United Nations as an instrument for peace.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILMA NISSLEY, PRESIDENT, DENVER BRANCH, WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

The Denver branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom supports the United Nations wholeheartedly, as an organization the main purpose of which is to maintain international peace and security. We believe that if this organization is approached as a meeting place, or a conference table around which representatives of countries of wide divergence of opinion may sit down to iron out their difficulties and by consultation and compromise work together to settle their differences, without any country or group of countries imposing its will upon the rest, it can be successful and we can see the accomplishments which it has achieved in the past 10 years. However, if we expect it to solve all of our problems, just in the manner we think they should be solved, without regard for the problems of the rest of the world, and without a willingness to compromise, we may not find the United Nations a satisfactory organization.

We believe that universality of membership should be the ultimate goal of the United Nations as it cannot successfully work out the problems and create the conditions of stability and well-being necessary for a peaceful world without all countries being represented. Inasmuch as there has been considerable resentment in our country at the use of the veto by the Soviet Union on the question of membership in the U. N., and there are a number of countries which the Soviet Union would like to see approved for membership, we would suggest that both groups effect a compromise and that all 21 countries which have now applied for membership be admitted in a block.

We urge that the United Nations, in an effort to present a consistent position, give priority to the clarification of the question of legality of representation to the United Nations from nations where a change of government occurs in a manner whereby a question is raised as to legal representation.

In past years numerous disarmament conferences among nations have been held where no great progress toward disarmament has been accomplished. The Disarmament Commission of the U. N. has made considerable progress and agreement has been reached on a number of points. Rather than that an attempt be made to change the charter, we believe that this Commission should be encouraged to work out the problems of disarmament. We realize that the charter does not call for total disarmament, but we would urge the Commission to work toward total, universal disarmament (each country only having enough forces for policing its own territory), rather than partial disarmament or reduction of armaments because only with this objective can there be real progress made and a satisfactory solution reached. Inspection for total disarmament would be much easier than inspection for partial disarmament.

Another point where there has been suggestion for revision of the charter is on the question of pacific settlement of disputes, especially in connection with the use of the veto. The Uniting for Peace Resolution, passed in 1950, has proven very helpful in this area. By this resolution the General Assembly may be called into session within 24 hours and by a two-thirds vote recommend collective action against an aggressor. While the General Assembly can only make recommendations and cannot actually take action, a very important effect can be attained by the moral pressure of a large number of nations uniting together in a resolution. Actually, by this resolution, a change in the charter has been effected without a conference or an amendment. This is another of the areas in which the Soviet Union has been criticized for using the veto. It is obvious that the Soviet Union would not give up the veto in those areas where she has found it useful without our giving it up in areas where we want it; the United States would not be willing to surrender the veto power in cases involving

use of our troops, nor would colonial powers in matters affecting their colonial interests. All the great powers favored this veto at the time of formation of the United Nations, with the object of securing unanimity of opinion before action was taken. Therefore, we would not think it realistic to expect to be able to amend the charter to abolish the veto in this area.

Rather than a conference for revision of the charter, we would encourage our Government to work for a conference to review the charter and to see if all the countries have been living up to all of its provisions and utilizing those provisions to the best advantage.

We would urge that an effort be made to establish a climate of mutual trust and respect among nations.

We would urge the United States, as well as all other countries, to work through the United Nations, rather than unilaterally, wherever there are any facilities for work through the U. N.

We would encourage greater financial support for the specialized agencies of the U. N. We would recommend that military alliances within and without the United Nations be abandoned since they transform the world into a military camp and increase world insecurity rather than promote security, and that all members of the United Nations place full reliance on negotiations as defined in chapter VI of the charter of the U. N. instead of resorting to threats of force.

At the time the charter was adopted, the climate of opinion was very much in favor of such an organization and there was more of a conciliatory mood and a desire for agreement. Today that attitude has changed somewhat. Without basic agreement among the great powers a conference would be ineffective and a danger to the existence of the United Nations, so we would rather see an attempt made to work under the present charter and to let it change and develop slowly, rather than to attempt major changes which might bring about its destruction.

AN OPEN LETTER FROM OSCAR P. NOBLE OF GLADE PARK, COLO.

1. The United Nations should be amended to include: A world commerce union department to exchange goods and render service to persons needing transportation to foreign lands as tourists. The ships and all other equipment should be owned by the United Nations in common with a common treasury. The personnel should be selected by and under the direction of the United Nations which should pay the salaries also. This department should be operated at cost of service. This department would relieve each nation of any need of shipping equipment and allow United Nations to place equipment where and when needed, and relieve useless duplication and waste.

2. The common treasury will produce a mutual interest between the nations of the earth just as it does with United States postal system in all the 48 States. The smallest and least income of the post offices in this postal system gets the 3-cent rate on first-class mail as the most paying post office, it's the strong supporting the weak under the principle of all for one and one for all.

3. Stabilization of freight and passenger service would remove contentions caused by divided interests accruing from private owned public utilities otherwise known as capitalism with its motto of everyone for himself and the survival of the fittest in the race for profit. Paragraph 1 takes profit out of consideration and replaces it with service at cost.

4. By inaugurating a budget system for the citizens of the various nations and totaling the orders, a close estimate of the goods and services needed by each nation would afford the statisticians the information to produce the goods and services to fill the budgets and the United Nations the amount of delivery equipment to provide to make the exchanges between nations wanting to exchange goods and services. These exchanges would be on a free trade basis, and of the goods and services not practical to produce within a nation's own borders. Under this plan: the time would come when all nations would learn war no more and would beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning forks.

5. (a) A universal language formed from all languages containing words best suited for United Nations should be produced and required to be used in all nations at all times in all United Nations transactions, with the privilege that each race may use their native language in domestic transactions.

(b) A medium of exchange by use of checks identified by fingerprint is necessary to prevent counterfeiting and forgery. Each nation should establish the same safeguard for use in domestic affairs.

6. The foregoing principles will remove the need for nations to keep diplomats in other nations and private enterprise (private ownership) of public utilities and natural resources ended, all nations would be in harmony with each other just as they are today under the Universal World Postal Union, and disarmament would be the natural outcome.

DOUGLASS, COREY & FISK,
Walsenburg, Colo., April 10, 1955.

Senators KNOWLAND and SPARKMAN,
Phipps Auditorium, Denver, Colo.

Dear SENATORS: We note from today's Post that you will confer with interested parties at Phipps Auditorium, in the city of Denver, on Monday, April 11, concerning their ideas relative to future action with respect to the United Nations, on the part of the United States. We therefore take the liberty of submitting the following suggestions:

We favor a review conference.

We favor the amendment of the United Nations Charter in the following respects:

1. The right to veto should not apply to admission to membership.
2. A system of "weighted" voting should supplant the present system of one vote for each nation.
3. The charter should clearly define "internal" and "international" affairs and the procedure of the United Nations in determining the status of any "affair" submitted to it for consideration.
4. The power of veto should remain with respect to any resolution, amendment, or other change in the United Nations Charter, under which it could take action which would endanger or violate any right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to its citizens.

In general, we are great because we have done those things which engender greatness and except, over the dead bodies of the majority of the citizens of the United States, should any action be taken which would endanger such national greatness.

Very truly yours,

J. H. P. FISK.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., April 10, 1955.

To the Senators Conference at Phipps Auditorium, Denver Colo.

GENTLEMEN: The question: What shall we do about the U. N.?

If such a question could have been asked years ago by the people and for the people, instead of by individuals, this very critical situation would have been avoided.

But because of relative ideas of a few men this thing was conceived.

For centuries, yes, from the beginning of creation, man has taken upon himself a power not of God, to do as he thinks. These conditions have brought the ways of death and destruction upon the earth.

The Lord himself while on earth said, "The ways of man seemeth right unto him, but the ways thereof are death."

So we have an answer there that should stop us and consider what way is right.

Was God ever considered in the conceiving of this organization? You can answer this as millions of us could do. God has a lot to say regarding any alliances, agreements, or associations, just as we parents warn our children of same. Knowing there are earnest men and women striving for world settlement—but this was not founded on the love of our Lord—hence confusion, and He is not the author of confusion. The 19th chapter of Acts says, "Now some cried one thing and some another," for the assembly was in confusion.

Is such rights of which one nation can veto every move to bring about justice and righteousness?

Korea war proved this—called the U. N. war. Our sons, husbands, and sweet-hearts fighting under a different flag—the U. N. flag. Working with these men, hearing their cries, why—why—why—they didn't know of secret agreements and alliances—but they do now. I cry aloud and spare not that God has complete plans, specifications, and codified principles of a nation and its body of laws of which no nation can stand without. Not "we the people" but individuals entered into many alliances with an anti-God nation—gave them support.

In our days—the Nazis and Fascists tried to force their programs by force of arms. They threw down the gauntlet to the whole world. We paid a terrible price.

War 2—we were still blinded. We gave billions of wealth to build up Russian communism, sitting by while they stole our secrets and infiltrated into positions where they could carry out their nefarious programs. God was ignored again. I personally stood in an assembly, never being offered a seat, led by a Communist believer.

So knowing their doctrines, ambitions, and to automatically do away with those who believe in God. Should we make agreements with such? The Lord said: "No other foundation can any man lay, except that which is already laid, which is Jesus Christ our Lord."

It should be—"What thus sayeth the Lord God."

This is the way our Nation was founded. This is the God whom we must trust. Keep our flag which was born symbolizing the highest type of government, liberty, the apex of civilization. The word of God—it is the challenge unto His second coming which is in the very near future.

Should we still appease Russia? Let's stop considering what man thinks and go back down on our knees in a national called day of prayer and fasting as Bible teaches us and God will hear us. Ezekiel 36th and 37th verses—"He shall yet be enquired of us to do this thing for us."

Let us not be ashamed to pray. Washington knelt in the snow and his dying words are the foundation of our foreign policy: "Never become entangled with foreign entanglement." If we do not do this our liberties shall be destroyed.

I have no language to express my contempt for those who hope to pull down our flag and substitute a system in which the liberties it symbolizes would be destroyed.

So I cry aloud and spare not. This whole Nation must be moved to prayer. This must not be taken lightly.

So great are the dangers, so grave the perils, so tremendous political problems, that it is imperative we lay hold upon the Lord God in prayer for His will to be done, not ours. He will save America for the people, by the people, and for a nation.

The answer can never be found in the United Nations nor any other organization, only by the word of God. May He help us.

Sincerely,

OPAL M. RAGAN.

DENVER, COLO., April 11, 1955.

Dr. ROBERT GOOD,
Social Science Foundation,
University of Denver, Denver, Colo.

DEAR SIR: We would like to make the following suggestions for amendments to the United Nations Charter:

1. That membership in the United Nations be open to all nations whose governments have demonstrated their ability to govern the territories they claim to represent.

2. That the powers of the General Assembly gradually be extended in the direction of world government; that these power be extended only as the Assembly demonstrates its responsibility and wisdom in its operations.

Respectfully submitted.

HILDA B. PARMATER.
HARRY A. PARMATER.

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX., April 5, 1955.

Mr. ROBERT GOOD,
University of Denver, Social Science Foundation,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the U. N. Charter, I'd like to propose:

1. The veto power be annulled.

2. That the U. N. be given power to control all international trade in the interest of peace with an international police force sufficient to effectively blockade any country found guilty by a U. N. court (majority vote or not more than two-thirds vote) of violation of international laws which might lead to war. I realize this would require certain safeguards to protect the economy of countries who might depend heavily on trade with the country being boycotted

but this aid would be much cheaper than armaments plus economic aid. And far more effective as any nation could be brought to their knees in 6 months without destroying resources.

Whether one agrees that international trade is the seed of war or not it is the root from which war can spread or be carried on by any nation for long. If we would kill a weed we must strike at its roots.

Everyone recognizes the value of the boycott but to use it unilaterally is a sure road to war. Therefore to be effective a majority of the nations of the world must adopt it as an instrument of preserving the peace of the world or we will all destroy ourselves in one way or another. This plan was not given a fair chance in the League of Nations largely due to the same type of short-range thinking that now advocates a unilateral boycott.

Never in the pages of history has power politics or massive armaments prevented a war. Delayed, perhaps, but eventually they lead only to a bigger war. Isn't it time we searched our souls honestly for a new formula before time runs out on us?

Would like very much to hear this discussed by competent men. In fact, would like to be able to take part in the discussion but that is not possible.

Thanking you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

N. G. VANSICKLE,
Veteran of World War I.

DENVER, COLO., April 10, 1955.

Dr. ROBERT GOOD,
*Social Science Foundation, University of Denver,
Denver, Colo.*

DEAR DR. GOOD: Here are a few suggestions for revision of the United Nations Charter:

Have the organizations divided into international unions of which the Pan American Union is one. Since it is already established, the British Commonwealth of Nations could be another. New unions to be formed, however, should be geographically connected, preferably all on the same continent. Each union should make every possible effort to keep peace in its own realm before calling on the United Nations for help.

Treat war like a contagious disease instead of a crime. When two or more nations are at war, declared or undeclared, sever all trade relations with them except food. This system prevented a major war in the Western Hemisphere in the middle thirties when Nicaragua and Venezuela were at each other's throats. It also (a modified form of it) prevented a long-lasting scrap between Peru and Ecuador from breaking out into a major war.

Suppose a big country does jump on a little country. Isn't it much easier to rebuild two countries than the entire world? Boundaries and other disputes are always settled around a conference table anyway, not by war. A conference of 20 nations at peace and two war-mad nations will bring a much more impartial settlement than a conference of 22 war-mad nations, even after the big nation has licked the little one.

Admit the Scandinavian nations and Switzerland, and ask Switzerland, the only nation that was able to keep completely at peace during two World Wars to lead the way to peace.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. SUGARS.

DENVER, COLO., April 12, 1955.

Dr. ROBERT GOOD,
*Social Science Foundation, University of Denver,
Denver, Colo.*

DEAR DR. GOOD: I missed seeing any notice of the hearings held in Phipps Auditorium yesterday until the announcements in last Saturday's Denver Post. The suggestions I handed you yesterday were hastily written and incomplete. I could see their weakness during the hearings, so, if it is not too late, I would like to make some additions:

First part: In establishing international unions as the members of U. N. rather than individual nations, the Soviet Union, as well as the British Commonwealth of nations could be one. If it is handled right that would tend to alienate and isolate the Soviet nations with expelling them. Also, I think the

technical lineup should be according to boundaries as they were 10 years ago when the United Nations Charter was ratified. That would put China, Tibet, and all nations to the south of them in the Asiatic Union instead of the Soviet Union. Then preparations could be made to demand the withdrawal of Soviet influence from these nations under threat of expelling the Soviet Union from U. N.

Second part: It was not my intention that the quarantine of nations at war should apply when the war area crosses a boundary of international unions. If a nation of one union attacks a nation of another union the entire union should jump to the defense of the nation that is attacked. In other words, the setup should be the same as we have had for years in the Pan American Union.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. SUGARS.

Senator SPARKMAN. May I say that if anyone who is included on our list gets tired of waiting and wants to do so, he or she may submit a statement. Just let any one of us know and it will be received and printed in full just as if you had given it.

All right, Mr. Boyer.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Boyer, the next witness will be Max Bulkeley.

STATEMENT OF RALPH BOYER, SOCIETY OF FRIENDS (QUAKERS)

Mr. BOYER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Mayor Newton, Mr. Rogers, I am representing the Denver Friends Meeting. We are usually referred to as Quakers.

The history of the Society of Friends (Quakers) has shown that social and political concern are an inseparable part of our religion. It is out of a concern that we as members of the Denver Friends Meeting wish to testify in relation to the proposed conference for review of the Charter of the United Nations. The Denver meeting is composed of approximately 20 adults, most of whom have actively participated in groups of a national and international character concerned with the improvement of human associations and the elimination of those conditions which would tend to prevent the realization of individual worth and dignity.

CHARTER CAN BE USED MORE EFFECTIVELY

We believe that in the United Nations we have an instrument appropriate to the maintenance of peace and security and the furtherance of cooperation among nations. Today, after 10 years of interpretation, the charter has not been exhausted. Much further amplification and interpretation are possible without revision. Laws and legal documents do not automatically alter human behavior. In the context of conflict, tension, suspicion, and economic uncertainties which exists and has existed among nations and peoples of the world, the possibilities of the United Nations as an instrument of trust have not been fully exploited. We believe that nations and their U. N. delegates must strive to approach the charter in a spirit of mutual trust and cooperativeness so that the available machinery can function more effectively and the ideals and common purposes of all men as expressed in the charter can be more fully realized.

Our only suggestions for actual revision would be as follows:

UNIVERSALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

Since the U. N. is an instrument for the achievement of the peaceful settlement of disputes among all nations, we believe that automatic and universal membership should be the goal. The extension of membership to those nations that now seek admission would be facilitated by placing the entire responsibility for the admission of new members in the General Assembly rather than necessitating initial approval by the Security Council. If revisions of the charter occur, article 4, section 2, should be modified to eliminate the phrase "upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Should charter revision take place, we believe that the validity of article 18, part 1, be stressed. We believe that in the General Assembly each nation, regardless of population or other criteria, should have one vote, and we would be opposed to any measure which would provide for weighted voting.

MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATION AND ARBITRATION

In relation to the improvement of the use of the present charter, we propose that nations should review the present charter with reference to a fuller implementation of present U. N. machinery for effective negotiation and arbitration. Elmore Jackson, writing in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November, 1954, makes several suggestions with which we concur, and which are summarized as follows:

(a) The Secretary General should seek to maintain the closest possible diplomatic relationship between himself and the heads of delegations representing the member states.

(b) Public debate of difficult questions before the Security Council should be limited at those times when prolonged debate might tend to harden the positions of the delegates. Private negotiations might be substituted.

(c) Subsidiary organs of the Security Council and the General Assembly, which are provided for in articles 29 and 22 respectively, offer possibilities. The Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation of the General Assembly, which has in the 5 years of its existence been used only once on the occasion of the appointment of Frank P. Graham to serve as mediator in the Kashmir dispute, has untapped resources for the exploration of conflict situations and the presentation of recommendations for their solution.

(d) These subsidiary negotiating organs should be given more freedom to make recommendations for settlement and to release these recommendations for public consideration when such consideration might be expected to promote settlement.

In addition to these, we would like to express the following:

(a) Article 57 which provides for the creation of needed specialized agencies, and articles 68 which allows the setting up of commissions in the economic and social fields should be given continued opportunity for work in these areas.

(b) International teams having diplomatic immunity should be more frequently used to investigate and arbitrate situations of conflict, and the finding of these teams should be more effectively publicized.

(c) The potentialities of the International Court of Justice should be reappraised to determine more effective use of this organ.

SUPPORT FOR SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

3. Finally, every opportunity for the explanation and facilitation of the work of the specialized agencies, the additional programs of the Economic and Social Council and the work of the Trusteeship Council should be fully utilized. These agencies seek to stimulate economic development through the technical-assistance program, to identify human rights through the work of the commissions, to stimulate the exchange of cultural and scientific information, and to provide a framework through which dependent peoples can progress toward self-government—thus taking an evolutionary approach to many problems which might potentially represent threats to the peace.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions, Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bulkeley.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Bulkeley, the next witness will be Mr. Donald S. Marler.

STATEMENT OF MAX M. BULKELEY, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. BULKELEY. My name is Max M. Bulkeley, 2295 Birch Street. I am a retired lawyer. I have taken a great deal of interest in the United Nations since it was first organized.

I feel that the charter is quite ample at the present time to cover practically all situations. The big thing that seems to me that needs changing is that veto power. The veto has practically nullified the workings of the Security Council. It has nullified the admission of other countries that should be in the United Nations at this time.

CHANGE IN VETO

My suggestion in my written statement was to change that veto power, which is found in article 27, section 3. I would have that to read that "All of the decisions of the Council shall be made by an affirmative vote of 8 members," any 8 members, and eliminate that veto power. I don't think that we need to be afraid of the veto power.

I realize that the United States wanted that 10 years ago, but we were all allies in a war effort at that time. The situation is entirely different now. The veto is the thing that has blocked the workings, a lot of the workings, of the United Nations. And if that could be changed, I think that is the one big major thing that ought to be changed in the United Nations.

Now, I am speaking for myself, but 3 weeks ago, when this was first announced in the local newspapers, this hearing, I made it a point after that to talk to anyone that I met, in my Rotary Club or on the bus or any other place, and I feel that I have contacted from 20 to 25 people, and they corroborate my own feelings in that the veto

power should be changed. That was unanimous. There was not a single individual I talked to but who felt that the veto power should either be eliminated or changed.

WITHDRAWAL OPPOSED

They also were unanimous in opposition to withdrawal from the United Nations.

I believe that we should never withdraw from the United Nations unless it was the last resort, unless the United Nations attempted in some way to interfere with the internal workings of the United States. We could do that: any nation could withdraw as a last resort if they wanted to do so.

Generally speaking, I think the United Nations Charter is ample at the present time, with this one exception. It was pretty universally felt, by the people that I have talked to, that the United Nations has accomplished a world of good. Perhaps the major thing is the technical assistance that we have rendered to other nations, and I was very sorry to note, Byron, that Congress had cut that appropriation in two. I hope it will be restored, or at least that the Senate will restore that, because I think that is the thing that we need, that the world needs, and that other countries need—technical assistance.

The thing that is making Communists is starvation, hunger, and all of that that we can help to eliminate by giving technical assistance to other nations of the world. It will be a wonderful thing not only for humanity but for world peace.

I think that is about all I care to say, gentlemen. I did not write out our remarks.

Are there any questions?

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions? Thank you, Mr. Bulkeley. We certainly appreciate it.

Mr. BULKELEY. Thank you.

(The written memorandum of Mr. Bulkeley is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY MAX M. BULKELEY, DENVER, COLO., IN RE REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Generally speaking, the present Charter of the United Nations is ample and sufficient, with one outstanding exception, the so-called "veto" power in the Security Council. The flagrant use of this power by Russia has almost nullified the usefulness of the Security Council. This ought to be changed.

I would suggest that article 27, section 3, should be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3 Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of any eight (8) members, provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3, Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

Under no circumstances should the United States withdraw from the United Nations. This is the sentiment of the great majority of the people with whom I have talked.

Likewise the great majority feel that the United Nations has accomplished much good and should be continued.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Marler.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Marler, the next witness will be Dr. Walter Orr Roberts.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Marler. Proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF DONALD F. MARLER, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MARLER. Senator Sparkman and members of the committee, I am Donald Marler. I am a salesman with the Dictaphone Corp. I represent no organization but speak as an individual. I want to thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

After World War II, I observed my neighbors' high hopes and enthusiasm for the new United Nations. Later I saw those high hopes change to distrust and fear. Basically, I believe that this change of attitude toward the United Nations was the result of an overwhelming disappointment—the realization that the United Nations could not protect us from another, greater war.

People talked about the advantages of preventive war, then, after greater reflection, rejected that idea as futile. At first they accepted isolation as a possible solution to a distasteful international situation, but soon they realized that in today's world isolation is impossible.

I imagine that the several million Americans who prepared their income-tax returns yesterday or will prepare them Thursday night would agree that the present arms program is an expensive luxury. A foreign policy based on and accepting a possible series of Koreas and a war-ready armed force is too costly if we are to live the kind of life we want. I called our present policy a luxury because our military leaders tell us that regardless of preparation we are still vulnerable to atomic attack.

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

I believe that more and more Americans are returning to the United Nations as their best hope for world peace and security. It is my feeling that they would support changes in the organization which would make it a more effective instrument for peace.

The power of the United Nations has already grown by interpretation of the charter and accepted practice. Those powers might conceivably continue to expand to the point where the United Nations would be able to deal effectively with the problem of security. But this natural expansion of power might also grow in other directions. I do not want this organization to assume any powers that could possibly interfere with the internal affairs of our country. I want the power of the United Nations clearly defined and clearly restricted.

The United States is pledged to support the motion for charter review. I believe that our people will support, and the people of other nations acclaim, proposals for charter revision to remove the physical and economic dangers of war.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

The charter should be changed to permit universal membership. The purpose of the United Nations is to establish peace among all nations. To accomplish this, all nations must share the advantages and obligations of membership.

ENFORCEMENT OF U. N. DECISIONS

The charter itself should outlaw war and require disarmament. These provisions should have the force of law on all nations and nationals. In this clearly defined and restricted field of disarmament

the charter should provide for inspection and enforcement. The charter will need to provide means of financing these vital functions.

The Charter Review Conference presents a timely opportunity for the United States to lead the world in the creation of what Mr. Dulles has called "an international order to shield national life."¹ I hope that we will assume our great responsibility and make the most of this opportunity.

Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions, Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes. I want to ask one question, to get specific. You propose that—

The charter itself should outlaw war and require disarmament. These provisions should have the force of law on all nations and nationals. In this clearly defined and restricted field of disarmament the charter should provide for inspection and enforcement. The charter will need to provide means of financing these vital functions.

Take the enforcement of the narcotic laws in this country. The proper officials learn that there has been a violation of the law; there is danger of narcotics getting out and being misused; they have the police power to raid. The same is true if machine guns, and so forth, were being accumulated.

Assuming you could get by the Soviet veto for such an inspection system, might you then not be faced with the fact that the United Nations itself would have to use force of arms in order to enforce its decisions?

Mr. MARLER. Well, Senator Knowland, you got off onto the narcotics situation. My personal belief is that the most important function of the United Nations is security, the prevention of war.

Senator KNOWLAND. I was merely using that as an example, where you use the police power to go in with the force of law. Applying that to a nation, if you could get around a Soviet veto and the Communists consented to inspection under the charter but then had a change of heart, and if we received word that they were manufacturing atomic weapons in subterranean positions or were illegally violating the terms of disarmament, would you not then have to use police power and the force of law and perhaps make war upon them to enforce your decision?

Mr. MARLER. That is why I limited this to enforce law and order on nations and individuals who would actually order atomic bombs to be built, so that you would not—I mean, if you took police action against the nation, of course, that would be war, but if you were able to go in and stop the individual who gave such an order, you would eliminate war.

ENFORCEMENT AND INTERFERENCE IN DOMESTIC MATTERS

Senator KNOWLAND. Then, isn't that running counter to your proposal that you do not want this organization to assume any powers that could possibly interfere with the internal affairs of our country? Would that not require United Nations inspectors or police to arrest a factory manager or a foreman, or whoever might be involved? Would that not in effect interfere with the domestic law?

¹ Before the American Bar Association, August 25, 1953.

Mr. MARLER. Well, in the field of armament, Senator, it would be restricted in the field of armament. If I gave an order as a factory manager to make some atomic bombs, they could arrest me, just like your limitation of the Federal Government. I mean, you are limited very definitely within a certain field.

The Federal Government, if I hit a man in the face—the Federal Government doesn't enter into that at all, whereas if I break a Federal law, an FBI agent can come in and arrest me.

Senator KNOWLAND. All right.

Having arrested this citizen, who is going to try him?

Will he be tried by a kind of Nuremberg tribunal, where the Russians are going to sit as judges? Suppose these are American citizens who have been arrested or the citizens of any country, by an international police force? I think when we are talking about amendments of the charter, we ought to get specific ideas as to how they would be tried, who would arrest them, where they would go for a trial. Since you have said that it would not interfere with domestic law, I did not quite see how the two statements were consistent.

Mr. MARLER. Well, I think that there is a very definite line between armament and our survival rights, and that the two could go along side by side without overlapping at all.

As to the specific question as to who would try these people, there are a great many possibilities. We have a World Court now which could try these people. Or it might be delegated to the Security Council if it is set up like that.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all. I merely wanted to explore it a little, because there are some very real problems involved, I think, on some of these recommendations which the Government of this country and the Senate and the United Nations itself will have to wrestle with, and, of course, there are no easy solutions to the problem.

Mr. MARLER. I fully realize that, and I said that I was speaking as a grassroot. My feeling is that in the field of armament—I know the U. N. does a lot of terrific good in other fields—but I think that that is its most important phase, that it was created to promote security, and I think that definitely it can be strengthened, made more effective in that field.

Now, I am only concerned about that one field, armament and security.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Dr. Roberts.

Mr. GOOD. After Dr. Roberts, the next witness will be Mr. Victor A. Miller.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Dr. Roberts.

Dr. ROBERTS. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Proceed in your own way, sir.

STATEMENT OF DR. WALTER ORR ROBERTS, BOULDER, COLO.

Dr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, my name is Walter Orr Roberts; I am a research scientist in the field of astrophysics and director of the High Altitude Observatory. I live

at 1829 Bluebell Avenue, Boulder, Colo. I am speaking as a private citizen. I welcome this opportunity to address a statement to the special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, regarding what appears to me the urgent necessity for strengthening the charter of the United Nations.

As a physical scientist I have been acutely aware of the explosive rise of the power of science and technology in this country. We are already in an age of high-speed rocket missiles, hydrogen weapons, nuclear reactors, and the acres of military development projects devoted to the pursuit of scientific research for military purposes. Artificial satellites are just ahead of us.

TECHNOLOGICAL STRIDES

It hardly seems possible that we are less than 50 years from the World War I situation when Thomas A. Edison could have been told that the United States Navy—or was it the Army—didn't need a chemist because it already had one. It is even more difficult to visualize where we shall be 50 years from now, unless—to borrow from Dr. Einstein—it be in the age of the bow and arrow. The accelerating development of scientific warfare confronts us, as a free people, with the crisis of the survival not just of our freedom, but of our very lives. If the things demanded of the U. N. seem heroic it is because the age is one where heroic advances have become commonplace; and some of the most heroic have been in the means of waging warfare.

We do not have to look far into the past to find a time when the nations of the world could safely contemplate war as a means of settling disputes. Our Nation, in particular, was protected by geography as well as by the strength of a resolute people. The revolution in science has ended that security; the threat of warfare imperils our liberties, our lives, and even the well-being of future generations. No longer is it a certain conclusion that mankind can survive an all-out world war.

In this situation the insurance of world peace and the interests of our Nation become identical. No longer is it possible to contemplate with equanimity the infinite continuation of the present world arms race. Our security today demands that the defense of our Nation and of our ideals be a double-barreled defense. One barrel is military strength; the other the control of warfare under some kind of firm and enforceable international law. The value of military strength as a defense is relative; we must be stronger than our enemies. It is also temporal; it offers us a time of equilibrium during which to formulate a solution that does not depend on an infinite expansion of material power—and no nation can survive any kind of infinite expansion of power.

LEGAL CONTROL OF WORLD WARFARE

Any consideration of the functions and powers of the U. N. that does not take as a fundamental premise the need to build systematically, progressively, and steadily toward the full legal control of world warfare is therefore totally unrealistic. I submit, for this reason, that it should be made the fundamental premise of the foreign policy of the United States that every possible step must be taken at every

possible opportunity to increase the legal powers of the U. N. in the direction of enforceable control of arms and of war.

Specifically, I feel that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should recommend the development of a firm United States position in favor of extension of the authority of the U. N., to whatever measure is necessary to give it power adequate to prevent warfare.

In so suggesting, I am not unmindful of the many serious obstacles in the way. Among these is the possibility that by so doing we might drive the U. S. S. R. out of the U. N. Even this would be preferable to maintaining a static world organization with hopelessly inadequate powers in the face of explosively expanding world machinery for warfare.

It is clear to me that substantial structural changes in the U. N. are necessary if it is to control world warfare. It is equally clear to me that the coming U. N. Charter review offers the United States an opportunity to assume world leadership in the movement to safeguard not only our own interests but the interests of all the peoples of the world by adopting realistic steps designed to prevent a world holocaust from which civilization might never recover.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Thank you very much, Doctor.

Mr. Victor A. Miller.

Mr. Good. After Mr. Miller, the next witness will be Mrs. S. Rhita Feingold.

I might say that we intend to hear six more this afternoon.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Miller, we are glad to have you before us.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senators.

STATEMENT OF VICTOR A. MILLER, FIGHTING HOME FOLKS OF FIGHTING MEN, GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO.

Mr. MILLER. I appear today before your honorable committee as the unworthy deputy of Capt. Eugene R. Guild, of the United States Army, retired, who is the national director of Fighting Home Folks of Fighting Men. Captain Guild speaks on behalf of 1,000 relatives, kinfolks, immediate families of American boys who fought, died, or lost their liberty while under the United Nations flag in Korea. These include his own son, who died with heroic gallantry. They also include 350 kin of the still missing but believed to be in the hands of the Communists, and the kin of 6 of the 15 airmen whom the Communists admit to holding.

Captain Guild's recommendation for his organization and his eloquent plea in behalf thereof have been placed in the hands of the committee, which has been very patient in listening to all viewpoints this afternoon, and it was my hope that I would not have to say anything further here. I regret to say that in spite of the somewhat large volume of opinion which has been broached to the committee, it seems to me that there has been one consideration which has been unspoken and one group which has been unrepresented, and however unworthy my voice, I feel I have a duty to speak it.

UNITED NATIONS ROLE IN KOREA

Now, the consideration that has been unspoken is this: It seems to me that in the light of commonsense, if nothing else, this committee, in considering what it proposes to do about the United Nations Charter, must contemplate how it worked in practice. And how did it work in practice? Well, I am sure I don't have to tell you.

The United Nations, in combination with the United States foreign policy, invited Communist aggression in 1950, by indicating that probably Korea would not be defended. Having invited the aggression, the United Nations put the call on hundreds of thousands of American boys. They were not born or bred to soldier life. They value peace as much as any of the persons who have expressed the pious hope of peace before your committee this afternoon.

Their country's summons did not call them from soldier life. It brought them in from the plow, the mine, the church—sometimes the sanctuary. They were brought on the bloody battlefields of Korea. They were compelled to fight a war, so to speak, with an arm behind their backs.

Three generals—three generals have testified that they could have won that war. Between American foreign policy and the United Nations, they did not win the war, the first in American history. Between American foreign policy and the United Nations, when it came to the fumbling peace proposals, America was treated to humiliating, dishonoring discourtesy.

It seems to me that those are the considerations which should appeal to your committee as you seek to determine what must be done with this entity.

And as you seek to do that, I think that you are, each of you, duty-bound to consider the voices which are voiceless here, the hundred thousand of those Americans who never returned or returned maimed, diseased, perhaps insane, from their experience, and they, gentlemen, valued peace and the pious thoughts as highly as any who have spoken before you.

Now, we honor the ladies and gentlemen who have come before you with pious thoughts of peace, but we do believe, with Abraham Lincoln, that every man's legs should be long enough to reach the ground, and certainly the legs of Senators who are representing this great country.

We believe that this country cannot be a sacrificial goat giving both blood and treasure for all the fights of the world. And as the Almighty has been here frequently invoked, I have before me the third verse of the 35th chapter of Isaiah, and I would like to leave the committee with this.

Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees.

Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: Behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence: He will come and save you.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Miller.

(The prepared statement of Capt. Eugene R. Guild, U. S. Army, retired, is as follows:)

**STATEMENT OF EUGENE R. GUILD, CAPTAIN, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED,
NATIONAL DIRECTOR, FOR FIGHTING HOMEFOLKS OF FIGHTING MEN**

On behalf of 1,000 kith and kin of American boys who fought, died, or lost their liberty while under the U. N. flag in Korea, including my son, and including 350 kin of the still missing believed to be in the hands of the Reds, and the kin of 6 of the 15 airmen the Reds admit holding, I recommend that Russia and its puppets be revised right out of the U. N.

As Russia upholds or dictates the holding of our soldiers, the present U. N. is like the Public Safety Commission of Chicago would be if it admitted to membership Al Capone and his hoodlums, who held for ransom the children of other members while supplying tommy guns to kill the commission's policemen.

The Reds in the U. N. work against the U. N. and for war and slavery. Fearful members, intimidated by the Reds' presence, influenced American leaders to disloyalty withhold from American soldiers in Korea the tactical and strategic support to which the American soldier is entitled. Through the U. N., the Chinese Reds were encouraged to attack, because they were tipped off that neither the U. N. nor the United States would do its utmost to defeat them. Being attacked, the U. N. thereupon tied its soldiers' hands; and its members, for profit, supplied the enemy with the means to kill U. N. and our soldiers.

The Reds violated the truce and held hundreds of our soldiers, but for 18 agonizing months, while American boys certainly died in captivity, the U. N. has taken no resolute action. Since September 1953, it has known the names of the 15 airmen; on the basis of the Red habit of secretly holding prisoners, it has known that there is a reasonable presumption that of the 4,706 still missing American soldiers several hundred are still alive in Red hands.

Under U. N. influence, the United States nullified even the token U. N. requests for the release of our men by withdrawing our troops capable of enforcing any real demand. Thereupon the Reds, as a gesture of contempt for the U. N.'s weakness, sentenced 11 of our airmen on false charges. The resultant public resentment forced our President to urge the U. N. to action. But the U. N. only made the typical impotent U. N. gesture of sending its Secretary-General with hat in hand to plead with the bandits. He returned, not with the prisoners, but with a movie of them—now being used to soften up mothers and get them to cease their efforts to free their sons.

A revised U. N. purged of Reds, can take effective action. Not action like the unspoken, dishonorable bargaining whereby we let 76 Chinese Red scientists and students take their knowledge of American defense techniques back to the Reds to be used against us—for the merely hoped-for return of but 15 of our several hundred captive men. A revised, stiff-spined U. N. can without war obtain the release of the soldiers betrayed by the present U. N.—by removing the blackmail value of those captives.

It only has to convince the Reds that all other pressures failing, there then remaining only the alternatives of abandoning its soldiers or fighting for them, this new U. N. has the courage to fight to liberate them, or to fight even harder to avenge them if they are harmed.

For world peace we need a U. N., but not this present U. N., which is a Communist-designed fraud, and is by its impotence an actual threat to liberty and to peace. Its ostensibly noble watchword is "There is no alternative to peace." But analyze that and it only means "Peace at any price."

What fighting homefolks is asking for is a reborn United Nations whose watchword will be, "There is no alternative to liberty."

Senator SPARKMAN. The next witness is Mrs. Feingold.

Mr. GOOD. After Mrs. Feingold, the next witness will be Rev. Edward Whittimore.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Mrs. Feingold. Proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF MRS. S. RHITA FEINGOLD, DENVER, COLO.

Mrs. FEINGOLD. I am Rhita Feingold of Denver.

As a housewife and mother of three children I am giving this testimony because I feel that the future of my family is at stake in the decision that you and other Senators and Representatives will make on our behalf regarding the United Nations organization. I feel that you are to be highly commended for taking this most urgent issue directly to the people.

We have now had almost 10 years in which to study the performance of the United Nations under its charter.

While much can be said for its accomplishments in the fields of health, medicine, and technical assistance, it has not achieved its primary purpose. It has not been able to assume the responsibility for ensuring the peace. Since the U. N. was conceived before the world knew the potential of the split atom, it certainly was not geared to this atomic—much less hydrogen—age. The United Nations has been powerless to halt the arms race which, with today's weapons, can mean universal annihilation.

The American representatives to the U. N. must act with the delegates from other countries to give the United Nations the power to abolish war as an available means for settling disputes.

UNIVERSAL, ENFORCIBLE DISARMAMENT URGED

This means that the United Nations Charter must be amended to provide for complete, universal, enforceable disarmament.

Complete disarmament would mean the elimination of all national arms and armies, with each nation permitted a small force capable of maintaining internal order. The limitations involved should be stated in the charter. This disarmament should take place according to a schedule also set forth in an amended charter.

Universal disarmament would necessitate that every nation of the world become an automatic and permanent member of the U. N. without the right of secession. Without this provision, disarmament could not effectively be enforced.

Enforceable disarmament will require the creation of what has appropriately been referred to as the United Nations Peace Force. This will be a standing force owing its primary allegiance to and paid by the United Nations, which will be capable of detecting and apprehending individual violators of arm prohibitions.

This peace force must be financed, and the U. N. must not have to depend on its member states. The revenue should come from a very carefully limited direct tax. This tax would be far less a burden on our pocketbooks than the present tremendous defense budget.

This peace force must be responsible to a representative world body to guard against its tyrannical use. This body should be the General Assembly which should be revised to have a more equitable voting system—taking population into account. The General Assembly will serve as a check on the peace force as well as a body to render advisory opinions as it now does.

The Security Council administering this peace force should have no absolute veto.

And finally, Senator Knowland, to answer a question that you asked before, the World Court must have the power to try violators and punish the guilty ones.

The American people as well as other peoples and governments should have these details spelled out for them in the charter. They have a right to know just what they're getting into before ratifying any amendments. They'll want to know exactly how the U. N. will assure the security they are seeking, and they'll want to be just as certain that the U. N. cannot assume any powers other than those needed for security.

As a vitally interested citizen I ask that you gentlemen decide in favor of strengthening the U. N. through the process of charter revision. Let us give it the power necessary to prevent the catastrophe toward which we are now heading.

The appointment of Harold Stassen as Special Presidential Assistant on Disarmament is an excellent beginning.

Let us advocate a truly enforceable system of world disarmament and watch world opinion go with us.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Feingold.

Mrs. FEINGOLD. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. The Reverend Whittemore.

Mr. GOOD. After Reverend Whittemore, the next witness will be Mr. Walter Moody.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Reverend Whittemore.

Dr. WHITTEMORE. Thank you, Senator Sparkman, members of the committee.

STATEMENT OF REV. EDWARD WHITTEMORE, COLORADO COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Dr. WHITTEMORE. I am here this afternoon to represent the Colorado Council of Churches, an interdenominational agency here in this State representing 11 denominations, and approximately 215,000 church members.

I know there has just been placed in your hands a mimeographed statement which I want to say first of all is the same statement which had been prepared by the first witness this afternoon, Rev. Harvey Hollis, representing the Denver Council of Churches. The reason we are presenting this is that the Colorado Council of Churches has not had a chance to prepare a separate statement of its own. We have not had the opportunity to get our delegates together from all over the State for this purpose.

But one of the departments of our council, the department of social education and action, has considered this statement very carefully, the one in your hands, which was prepared in the first instance by the Denver area council of churches, and has given, as a department of the State council, it full endorsement and unanimous approval to this statement, and with the consent of the Denver Council of Churches, we would like to make it our own statement as well.

When the first witness was reading his statement, he was not able entirely to complete the reading of it, and with your permission I would like to finish the last few sentences, beginning with the middle of the fourth paragraph.

SUPPORT FOR U. N.

It is a forum for the debate of issues which continue to divide men, and a rallying point for cooperation concerning issues upon which there is unity. It is an agency dedicated to pioneering the development of means for the mutual solution of mutual problems.

We warmly endorse the ongoing activities of the World Health Organization, the Children's Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, and the many other specialized agencies associated with the United Nations. We urge the expansion of these programs, and especially the work of technical assistance under the United Nations.

We enthusiastically support the ongoing efforts through the United Nations to achieve an enforceable system of disarmament with universal inspection.

In conclusion, we affirm our responsibility to seek a strengthened U. N., if possible through charter revision. Yet we affirm equally our continuing obligation to take advantage of the numerous opportunities, presently available under the United Nations, to discharge our responsibilities in an interdependent world.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Reverend Whittemore. Mr. Moody.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Moody, the next witness will be Rev. William J. Marshall.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you here today, Mr. Moody. You proceed as you see fit.

STATEMENT OF WALTER MOODY, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MOODY. Senators Knowland, Sparkman, and Mansfield, I trust that the worthy Senator from Montana and the Senator from Alabama will not feel slighted by my salutation which greeted Mr. Knowland first, but up until last year I was a resident of California, and Mr. Knowland was my Senator.

Then, so that Senator Knowland will not feel slighted by my leaving California's golden shores, I will offer a bit of an excuse, in that I am a trout-fishing advocate, besides having an interest in the U. N. problems, and I thought that by moving to Colorado, I might have opportunity to view firsthand the trout-fishing techniques of a certain famed angler who frequents these Rocky Mountain streams and whose last name is Eisenhower.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are you speaking for the local chamber of commerce?

Mr. MOODY. For the Isaac Walton League.

In these United Nations Charter discussions, I speak as a private citizen, representing only myself and perhaps my wife.

Senator SPARKMAN. I am glad you put in that word "perhaps."

Mr. MOODY. One part of the United Nations which I see as a thing that I view with suspicion is the possibility that it might be turned into a world government.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Now, I have heard Paul G. Hoffman, who is a quite rabid U. N. supporter, say that—

The United Nations is not a world government and never will be a world government.

Now, perhaps Mr. Hoffman is right. Yet in my travels across this Nation and into Canada, in the field of petroleum engineering, I have attended U. N. meetings and other public meetings, and I have heard folks in responsible positions openly advocate the U. N. as world government.

Last month in Regina, Saskatchewan, a gentleman who was a national executive member of the United Nations Association for Canada openly advocated a world government and wanted a U. N. police force.

Now, in reviewing the charter, there is paragraph 7 of article 2, which I believe should be substantially revised. That is the one part of the charter which assures a member nation that the U. N. will not interfere in its domestic affairs.

I believe the last two lines of that particular paragraph nullify the paragraph itself.

My revision would encompass the idea that the U. N. specifically state in its charter that it is not an instrument of world government and that the United States in particular and other nations, if they so desire, will not have any of their domestic affairs censored or ruled on by the United Nations.

Now, there are several other major revisions which I believe are required of the charter before it can be at all compatible with our Constitution. But to me, the most important measure, the most important change is this insertion of an assurance that membership in the U. N. will not lead to world government and that the United States can continue as a sovereign state under God as envisioned and established by the men who wrote our Constitution.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are there any questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Moody.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Moody is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY WALTER MOODY, AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN, ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

Senators Knowland and Sparkman, I trust that the illustrious Senator from Alabama will not feel slighted by my salutation which mentioned Mr. Knowland first. I should explain that up until last year California was my home and Mr. Knowland my Senator.

Then, so Senator Knowland will not feel slighted through my leaving California's golden shores, I hasten to add that a major interest of mine (besides observing the United Nations situation) is trout fishing. By moving to Colorado I felt I might learn first hand the fly-fishing techniques of a certain famed

angler who frequents these Rocky Mountain streams and whose last name is Eisenhower.

In these United Nations Charter discussions I talk to you as a private citizen, representing only myself and perhaps my wife. My profession is petroleum engineering. I'm a capitalist in my economic thinking and a rigid constitutionalist in my political thinking.

One great distrust of the United Nations which I share with many Americans is: There are those within and surrounding the U. N. who are actively seeking to remove sovereignty from individual nations and to set up the Organization as a world government.

From the lips of Paul G. Hoffman, a vigorous United Nations supporter, I have heard the words "The U. N. is not a world government and never will be a world government." Perhaps Mr. Hoffman is right. Yet in my frequent travels across this country and into Canada I have heard others in responsible positions openly advocate U. N. as a world government. Last month in Regina, Saskatchewan, J. A. Christie, national executive member of the United Nations Association of Canada, speaking on a public forum, called for the assembly of a U. N. police force and the formation of a world government.¹

I therefore respectfully but firmly suggest that article 1, paragraph 7, of the charter be revised to specifically state that world government is not an aim of the United Nations and that the United States in particular, and other nations if they so desire, shall never be expected to give up any portion of national sovereignty to the United Nations.

Paragraph 7, as now worded in the charter, is supposed to protect a nation's domestic life from interference by the U. N., but this provision is actually self-nullifying in its last two lines.

Several other major changes are required of the United Nations Charter before it is at all compatible with our Constitution, but the most important change is the insertion of an assurance that membership in U. N. will not lead us into world government, and that the United States will continue a sovereign state, under God, as established by the marvelous men who gave us the Constitution.

[From the Regina, Saskatchewan, newspaper, March 1955]

PANEL DISCUSSES REVISION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The United Nations should amend its charter to broaden its scope was the majority view of a three-man panel discussing the question Sunday afternoon in the city hall before an audience of 40 at the People's Forum.

Alex R. Cameron, on the Regina executive committee of the Institute of International Affairs, demurred as the third member of the panel.

J. A. Christie of Regina, national executive member of the United Nations Association of Canada, and S. T. Malach, director of the public relations committee of the Regina Community Chest, gave the majority view.

Mr. Christie took the view that the charter should be revised to promote universal membership in the U. N., assemble a U. N. police force while enforcing disarmament and generally smooth the way to eventual world government.

Mr. Malach wanted a number of revisions to increase the U. N.'s power to enforce world peace which he said was the principal reason for its existence. He advocated cancellation of the sponsorship principle for applicant nations which he said should be permitted to join regardless of security council decisions.

Mr. Cameron took the stand that the U. N. is functioning with sufficient smoothness to evolve better techniques of handling international tensions on its own. Interference at this time would not be justified because it would be more of a disruptive influence than a benefit.

The U. N. Charter itself is not the cause of world tensions and changing it would not change the world situation. It should be allowed to grow in similar fashion to the unwritten constitution of Great Britain which is based on precedent and has proved flexible in meeting new situations, he said.

Both Mr. Christie and Mr. Malach said they believed changes in the charter would provide a wider channel for siphoning off the overflow of mounting world tension.

E. W. Campbell, member of the Regina branch of the U. N. association in Canada, was moderator.

¹ Appended is a photostat of the newspaper writeup confirming the remarks made about Mr. Christie. Clipped from the Regina paper, March 1955.

The panel had discussed the same question last week at a regular meeting of the Regina U. N. Association branch in the public library.

Senator SPARKMAN. Reverend Marshall.

Mr. GOOD. After Reverend Marshall, the next and last witness will be Mr. F. C. Pieper.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. MARSHALL, D. D., RAWLINS, WYO.

Dr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, fellow Americans, as long as the Communist regime is in power at Moscow there can be no peace in the world. Peace is the fruit of righteousness and without the triumph of justice and right there can be no peace.

The basic failure of the United Nations lies in not recognizing the leadership of the living God and the unchanging authority of right and truth in world affairs.

COMMUNIST MOTIVES

Russian communism has totally eliminated moral and spiritual principles from its teaching and practice. For God and Christ they have substituted man-made dialectic materialism based on Godless evolution. Their foundational principles have been lucidly enunciated by the official Communist leaders.

Lenin writes:

We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding and concealing truth. We can and must write in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, scorn, and the like, toward those who disagree with us.

Stalin was the greatest slave master and murderer in history, condemning multiplied millions to slavery or death. His principles are clearly stated in his book *Problems of Leninism*, a book published long ago and available to everyone. He writes:

It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states—ultimately one or the other must conquer. * * * What is our country, as it builds socialism, but a base for the world revolution? * * * Dictatorship means power resting on violence, not on law.

Every leader of church and state is without excuse for not knowing these hard facts.

The failure of neutrality on basic issues was never more clearly revealed than on March 30, 1955, when Prime Minister Nehru of India proclaimed to the world that Matsu and Quemoy should be handed over to Red China, and then added that Formosa should also be surrendered to the Reds.

This is the Communist line and indicates a full surrender to Communist propaganda. On the same occasion he charged the West with instigating the war menace in the Orient. This is the man whose nation has received extensive help from the United States.

In the present attempt to amend the charter of the United Nations into a world government we find a clever conspiracy with a double purpose— to destroy the sovereignty and power of the United States and to deal death to our Constitution.

GODLESSNESS OF CHARTER CHARGED

We need now the inspiring guidance of Franklin's words at the Constitutional Convention:

I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proof I see that God governs in the affairs of men. Without His concurring aid we can proceed no better than the builders of Babel.

In direct disregard of this Divine aid, the United Nations recently condemned North Korea to Communist domination, and at Geneva denied the right of self-determination to North Vietnam and turned that unhappy land of 11 million people over to Communist enslavement.

Communist Russia has violated every salient principle of the United Nations Charter, yet remains a member in good standing. For her rank crimes of enslavement and murder, no effective rebuke has ever been administered by the United Nations. This spineless organization has failed to cleanse itself of inside despoilers and is not qualified to continue as a trustworthy organization.

The United Nations is a counterfeit substitute for God's plan for our America and the free nations. This plan is strikingly portrayed on the Great Seal of the United States, both sides of which are found on every dollar bill.

On this seal America is shown as a new order of the ages under the guidance of the all-seeing eye of God. The Bible plainly proclaims that God's people were to make no covenants with Godless nations. It may be well that the "Covenant with death and hell" in its final and worst form, portrayed in Isaiah 28, is none other than the covenant of Christian nations with pagan and atheistic nations in the United Nations.

If so, the outcome is clearly shown in verse 18:

Your covenant with death shall be annulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand.

America had better hear and heed Almighty God for the nations that forget God shall perish.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are there questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. There is another quotation which might be of interest to you from the Second Corinthians:

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

Dr. MARSHALL. Excellent, Senator Knowland.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Pieper, please.

**STATEMENT OF FRED C. PIEPER, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, CIO REGION
12, COLORADO, WYOMING, MONTANA, IDAHO, UTAH**

Mr. PIEPER. Chairman Sparkman, members of the committee, Congressman, I appear before this committee as the director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations of region 12, which includes the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and Utah. In this area, there are 152 local unions representing 75,000 persons.

We have functioning in these States five State councils which speak for the membership in their respective States. Also, there is an established Denver Area CIO Council representing some 10,000 members. I am privileged to speak here on behalf of all of these organizations.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations takes great pride in the fact that it has been and now is one of the staunchest advocates of the United Nations, and that it has consistently given vigorous support to many of its specialized agencies.

We believe that the United Nations Charter should be considered a living document. We believe it to be an instrument intended to meet the need of the present and the future, as well as to protect all that is good for the peoples of the world, in the past.

OBSTACLES FOR THE U. N.

We are keenly aware of the tremendous difficulty which the United Nations has encountered since its inception in 1945.

We recognize that Communist aggression and obstruction has greatly added to the problems of the United Nations.

Also, it must be recalled that the era of the hydrogen bomb and other other weapons designed for mass destruction were only dimly on the horizon in 1945.

We are also aware that within our own homeland there is a small but active minority who would urge that our country withdraw from the United Nations, and to isolate ourselves from the other free peoples of the world. We are confident that the vast majority of the peoples of the United States do not subscribe to this shortsighted and suicidal policy.

On the contrary, we believe that the American people are willing and eager to accept their responsibilities as a member of the family of nations.

We are mindful of the tremendous accomplishments of the United Nations, particularly of the specialized agencies. We believe much has been done in the interest of peace and security in our time and to reduce the area of poverty, illiteracy, disease, and hunger.

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

It is our sincere hope that our Government's delegation will take a leading role in support of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, and that all of these people will enjoy through the fulfillment of the United Nations Charter the degree of human progress that is so essential if they are, in fact, to become and remain a free and independent people.

It is our strong conviction that peace in our time and in the future cannot and will not be achieved by military might, but rather that the attainment of this universal hope will come by the elimination of disease, hunger, ignorance, and the establishment of decent human standards of living. The United Nations is the only human instrument available to all freedom-loving people through which the hopes and aspirations of the people of the world can be made a reality.

For these reasons, we believe that the United Nations must not only have the active and vigorous support of this Nation, but that

we must in every possible way strengthen its hand. While I may not qualify as an expert on the many complicated problems which are involved, there are a number of them which the organization I am privileged to represent has studied and from such studies, has arrived at conclusions which have been expressed in various documents. I present for the committee's consideration a copy of the resolution which was adopted by the national CIO convention in December of 1954, in the city of Los Angeles.

(CIO Resolution No. 47 is as follows:)

CIO RESOLUTION No. 47 (UNITED NATIONS)

The CIO reaffirms its support for the United Nations and its specialized agencies. An effective United Nations is vital to the security of the United States in this interdependent world. It is urgent that we strengthen the U. N. by working through it so it will be powerful enough to take collective action for collective security and to bridge the chasm of a divided world without either the appeasement of totalitarian tyranny or the horror of total war.

Revision of the United Nations Charter should have as its goal the facilitation and strengthening of the organization. At the same time, we must also be more vigorous in our defense of the U. N. and its specialized agencies against the isolationist and know-nothing individual and organization attacks, which aim to have us withdraw from the U. N. and go it alone against the rest of the world.

Closely related are the efforts to limit, through the Bricker amendment or other disguised forms, the treaty-making power of the President and the Senate and the constitutional responsibility of the President to conduct our foreign relations. We oppose those moves which are concerted efforts to limit our participation in world affairs, including the United Nations. We must also guard against further excesses in the supposed search for Communist or fellow-traveling influences which have diminished the areas of free public debate on which sound judgments on foreign policy rest. The morale of American employees of the U. N. has been impaired and the confidence of the free world in American leadership has been undermined.

We support the United States proposal for a United Nations Disarmament and Atomic Development Authority and urge that the Atomic Pool Authority now being credited for the humane development of atomic energy should be established and maintained under the United Nations. We welcome the apparent progress toward acceptance of the United States proposal by the U. S. S. R. and other nations as a sign of real hope in accomplishing the objectives of the Atomic Pool Authority. The atomic pool agency within the United Nations can provide a pattern and precedent for the atomic control agency which must someday be developed if universal disarmament is to be achieved. The creation of the atomic pool within the U. N. relates not only to future implementation of the disarmament proposals but, more immediately, to the program of technical assistance where the application of atomic energy will have limitless possibilities for a more abundant and creative life for all people.

We must continue our efforts in the U. N. to find a workable and effective disarmament plan. Despite the obstacles and difficulties, we urge our Government to persevere vigorously in the search for universal enforceable disarmament of all weapons of mass destruction and the reduction to a minimum of all other weapons; with effective provisions for continuous and simultaneous inspection and control under the U. N.

We regret our Government's opposition to date to the proposal for a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED). The fund which would require an initial outlay of \$250 million would be a step toward solving one of the major problems facing underdeveloped countries and finding new ways of financing economic development. Certainly the economic development of the underdeveloped countries is in many ways the most pressing economic problem of our time. We strongly urge the reversal of the United States position.

Closely related is the need for the expansion of the United Nations technical assistance program. While recognizing the unfortunate handicaps imposed upon our U. N. delegation by congressional action, we urge the delegation to be mindful of the major role of the United States in the inauguration of the technical assistance program and of the program's paramount importance in our world-

wide war against poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease. For United States participation in this program to be chopped in half by Congress just at the time when Russia is beginning to contribute is particularly senseless. The need is for contributions by all nations in personnel, material, and funds. The national, binational, and multinational programs should all be coordinated with the technical assistance program of the U. N.

The CIO finds particular satisfaction in the adoption of the historic Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Human Rights Day is celebrated on December 10 in many parts of the world. We note this important observation and rededicate ourselves to the achievement of universal human rights. We urge that active and continued efforts be made for the effective implementation of the Declaration of Human Rights. We consider as unfortunate the position taken by our Government declaring in advance it will not sign or present to the Senate any human rights covenants when completed. We urge the Government to consider, on its merits, any covenant which may be presented. We urge our Government to press for ratification of the pending Genocide Convention and to sign and ratify the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

The greatly needed and constructive activities of the various specialized agencies of the U. N. require and deserve our increased support. The International Labor Organization (ILO), which is the only U. N. agency which has direct labor participation is carrying on the needed task of helping to raise living standards and achieving social justice throughout the world. Our support for the ILO should be increased and we must defend it against the attacks of certain employer groups.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has made a real contribution in raising world literacy and educational standards. The work of this agency has been attacked and its aims misrepresented by the reactionary and crackpot groups. Our positive defense of UNESCO and its essential work must be more vigorous.

We believe contributions to the U. N. general budget or the specialized agencies are the best possible investment in peace. We believe the dollar ceilings placed by Congress on United States contributions should be removed.

We support the administration's request to Congress for the full amount of the United States pledge to the Refugee Fund and United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). It is tragic that the lives of many people hang in the balance because of congressional refusal to appropriate one-half million dollars for refugee relief.

We express our continued support of the work that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) is carrying on at the U. N. in its consultative capacity, interpreting the position of the free trade unions on important issues.

The United Nations represents mankind's best hope of achieving our ultimate goal—the abolition of war and the establishment of a system to maintain justice and the rule of law. To reach that goal, we must achieve enforceable disarmament, divert vast armament expenditures into building up the underdeveloped areas of the world, support the aspirations of all peoples to be free and to maintain their freedom from foreign domination. To this end, we pledge ourselves to an increasing, active support for the U. N. and its specialized agencies.

Mr. PIEPER. Further, I should point out that we in the CIO believe that the opportunity for the revisions of the United Nations Charter provides to our Government an unequalled opportunity to advocate and support such proposals as are designed to strengthen the United Nations.

We would deem it to be a world tragedy if the charter review conference this year were to become a standoff, or the stage for the dissolution of the United Nations. It is our hope that the responsible representatives of our country will enter into discussion with the other great powers in the United Nations which would insure and facilitate the success of the charter review conference.

CHARTER AMENDMENTS URGED

We would urge that this conference give earnest consideration to the following amendments to the charter which, in our view, will strengthen the United Nations as a world organization.

1. The veto power: We hold that the veto power has been abused and that a way must be found by which such abuse can be reduced, if not entirely eliminated, particularly as it applies to the admittance of new member nations.

2. Peaceful settlements of disputes: The present provision which requires that, in the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations, a vote of seven members of the Security Council including the concurring votes of the permanent members of the Security Council must be changed. We believe that an amendment which would provide that a vote of any seven members be required would facilitate the work of the United Nations in this area.

3. Inspection commissions: An amendment should be made which would permit commissions of the United Nations to investigate conditions which threaten international peace and security within the boundaries of United Nations member territories.

4. Enlarging effectiveness of the Security Council of the United Nations: Constantly changing conditions, we believe, require that the General Assembly on recommendation of the Security Council should be free to increase the number of its members and or add new permanent members to the Security Council. We believe such an amendment necessary.

5. World law: It is our thought that the charter should spell out more completely and clearly the principle that members shall observe the rules and principles of international law, of the charter, and of the agreements to which they are parties. Clearly, the interpretation and application of those rules and principles are international questions not within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. Such amendments would certainly strengthen the legal basis upon which the United Nations is founded.

6. Information concerning the United Nations: Since world public opinion, in the final analysis, in large measure determines the strength and effectiveness of the United Nations, it appears to us highly desirable to provide the necessary mechanism and obligation on the part of member nations to encourage the circulation among their people of information concerning the decisions and recommendations authorized by the United Nations.

NEED TO COOPERATE FOR PEACE

In conclusion, we feel that we must point out that in this era of hydrogen mass destruction the consideration which overshadows all others is that of eliminating—for all time—the human tragedy of war which is today constantly with us.

Every American, regardless of economic interest or political party, indeed, all freedom-loving people on the face of the earth have a solemn, moral obligation to support the United Nations so that a secure peace—based upon social justice and human freedom—will become a reality in our day.

Our faith in this accomplishment is strong and unshakeable. We are of the firm conviction that a world society that has reached the heights of technological and industrial accomplishments to which we have today advanced can certainly find the formula and means to reach equivalent heights of perfection in the field of human relationships.

Shortly before he died, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world at peace.

The prophecy contained in this observation by a great American, who undoubtedly had a greater intimate knowledge of world affairs than any other living person of his day, should be even more obvious today.

In our rush to build this Nation—and our headlong haste to outstrip our competitors—we seem to have forgotten that we have been mandated by our Creator that we are, in fact, our brother's keeper. But there is an encouraging trend toward a better understanding of human relations and the democratically applied art and science of developing mature human understanding and cooperation.

This quest for understanding must begin with ourselves, with positive, not negative attitudes—with a deep awareness of the moral obligation we have to our fellow men.

It is our hope and prayer that the participants of the charter review conference will remember this fundamental obligation throughout their deliberations.

Thank you for your courtesy, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions? Thank you very much.

Before we recess, let me say that Senator George, the chairman of our committee, wrote a letter to both the Senators from Colorado, inviting them, if they could do so, to sit in on these hearings. We have received a letter from Senator Allott, explaining why he could not be present. That letter will be received for the record.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
March 29, 1955.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE.

United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I have your letter of March 16, and I have been giving very careful consideration to your kind invitation to join your committee in Denver when proposals for revision of the United Nations Charter are discussed on April 11. I have delayed answering until I could ascertain my own situation, but it now appears that other committee assignments here will necessitate my presence. I cannot, therefore, accept your kind invitation.

Will you please extend my regrets to your committee, and I would appreciate it if you would inform those at the hearings of my inability to be present.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON ALLOTT.

Senator SPARKMAN. May I remind you that if for any reason you would rather not await your time in the hearings to present your statement, you may file your statement, and it will be printed in the record in full.

We do not urge you to do that, but we want you to know that you have that privilege if you wish to take advantage of it.

The committee will stand in recess now until 7:30 tonight.

(Whereupon, at 4:55 p. m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 7:30 p. m. the same day.)

EVENING SESSION

Senator SPARKMAN. We will resume the hearings where we left off at the time we recessed.

PROCEDURAL RULES

Before doing this, I assume there are a good many witnesses and observers here who may not have been here during the afternoon. So I would like to state just 1 or 2 of our rules of procedure, if I may.

The witnesses who might not have been here in the afternoon, have all been informed that they would be limited to 5 minutes for the presentation of their statements. If you do not get to finish your statement and you have it in written form, the full statement will be printed in the record of the hearings. If you care simply to submit it and then to summarize your statement, you can do that.

When your name is called I ask you to come promptly. We will ask the first witness to come on up, and then the second witness will be called, and we will ask that witness to be prepared to come right on the stage immediately after the first is released.

After 4 minutes of testimony, the young lady sitting over here keeping time will notify you that there is 1 minute remaining, and at the end of 5 minutes, notice will be given that the time is up and the witness will be expected to stop, but not to leave immediately for the simple reason that we may want to address a question.

With reference to the audience, we ask that there be no manifestation of approval or disapproval of anything that is said by any witness or any one of us at any time. We ask that primarily for the purpose of saving time. It is also in keeping with the Senate rules, and as a committee of the Senate, we are operating under the Senate rules.

I ask that you keep that in mind. I know that sometimes a person may forget, but try to catch yourself and do not do it.

Before we start, I want to recognize again Congressman Rogers of this district. He was with us this afternoon. I believe every one of us up here had something to say except the Congressman. He did not open his mouth during the whole of the afternoon. I do not want him to get off that easy.

Congressman, we would appreciate it if you would say something at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. You might not be reluctant to do that. Most of those people are probably your constituents.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ROGERS

Mr. ROGERS. That is what I was going to say, Senator. Seated out in the audience are the best people in the world. They are my constituents, and I am delighted that you and Senator Knowland accepted the invitation of Mayor Newton to come to the city and county of Denver and conduct the hearings in the mile-high city, of which we are all so proud, for I am sure that when you have finished your testimony here, you will learn that the people in the city and county of

Denver are ever mindful of the U. N. and its relation to the peoples of the world, with the hope that we can maintain peace and a proper understanding of the world's affairs.

Again I want to congratulate the committee in coming to the city and county of Denver.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Congressman.

Just lest you be fooled into thinking that all those people are your constituents, I want to tell you that I see some of mine out there.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I hope they like the city so well that they stay and no longer become your constituents.

Senator SPARKMAN. You and I part right there. We will call the first witness, Mr. Newstrom; Mr. Paul M. Newstrom, please.

Mr. GOOD. The next witness will be Mr. Dunklee.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Newstrom.

Mr. NEWSTROM. Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Just proceed in your own way.

Mr. NEWSTROM. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF PAUL M. NEWSTROM, CHAIRMAN, AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC., STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. NEWSTROM. My name is Paul M. Newstrom. I live at 501 Claremont Street, Denver, Colo. My occupation is a general contractor.

I am a member of the National Sojourners Americanism committee, and chairman for the State of Colorado. I appear representing in particular the membership of the National Sojourners, Inc., of the State of Colorado.

National Sojourners, Inc. was founded in 1919. It is a nationwide nonprofit patriotic organization, composed of Free Masons who are, or have been, officers or warrant officers in any of our Armed Forces. It is a national growing association with chapters in almost every State of the Union and with numerous chapters beyond our national borders. Most of the membership have performed active military service during wartime.

Many of our members have made the supreme sacrifice either upon the battlefield or as a result of wounds or disease. However, we are not a flag-waving organization, merely performing our duties as loyal Americans as best we can.

National Sojourners appreciate this opportunity of appearing before this committee to present its views concerning the serious matters now being considered; concerning how best to achieve peace, international understanding and world cooperation in the best interests of our country as a sovereign nation.

PURPOSES OF NATIONAL SOJOURNERS

Organized with the primary purposes of developing true patriotism, and composed of members who have had international experience through travel and duty on behalf of our country, National Sojourners favors these foregoing essential objectives. It supports all efforts within our constitutional processes to achieve them. A further pur-

pose of National Sojourners is to oppose any influence whatsoever which would tend to weaken our national security. Under these standards, in recent conventions, National Sojourners has adopted resolutions opposing and reaffirming its opposition to the establishment of a world government or other type of supergovernment. National Sojourners opposes any attempt to extend additional power to the United Nations organization, however sincere the purposes might be, at the expense of weakening the security of the United States. National Sojourners opposes any plan or proposal which would restrict or reduce in any way the sovereignty and independence of the United States. It is deeply convinced that many of the current plans and proposals would, if adopted, have that result and that they would retard rather than advance the very objectives sought to be accomplished by their proponents.

We are opposed to the establishing of any form of world government. We are also opposed to any amendments to the United Nations powers such as the restriction of or limitation upon the veto powers; the restriction of membership in the United Nations to all nations regardless of the principles under which they are governed; the establishment of so-called world law enforceable directly upon individuals; to vest in a world organization the power to tax, the power to establish, maintain and use military forces to enforce world law with a prohibition against the maintenance except for national policing purposes; the adoption of a convention of human rights.

We favor the Bricker amendment regarding treaties and international agreements.

In closing, I wish to state what President Eisenhower said:

Without a continuation of the basic principles on which our Nation was founded, our system of government cannot endure.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions, Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. NEWSTROM. Thank you, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Your whole statement will be printed.

Mr. NEWSTROM. I have presented that, yes, sir. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Newstrom is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF PAUL M. NEWSTROM, NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC., REGARDING
AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

I. INTRODUCTION

My name is Paul M. Newstrom and I am chairman of the Americanism Committee of National Sojourners, Inc., for the State of Colorado. I appear, representing in particular the membership of the chapters of National Sojourners, Inc., of the State of Colorado, to present this statement on behalf of them and of all National Sojourners. This is the statement which would be made by the national president of National Sojourners, Maj. Albert W. Houghton, Chicago 2, Ill., had it been possible for him to be present today.

National Sojourners, Inc., was founded in 1919. It is a nationwide nonprofit patriotic organization, composed of Free Masons who are, or have been, officers or warrant officers in any of our Armed Forces. It is a national growing association with chapters in almost every State of the Union and with numerous chapters beyond our national borders. Most of the membership have performed active military service during wartime.

National Sojourners appreciates this opportunity of appearing before this committee to present its views concerning the serious matters now being considered; concerning how best to achieve peace, international understanding, and world cooperation in the best interests of our country as a sovereign nation.

II. PURPOSES OF NATIONAL SOJOURNERS

Organized with the primary purposes of developing true patriotism, and composed of members who have had international experience through travel and duty on behalf of our country, National Sojourners favors these foregoing essential objectives. It supports all efforts within our constitutional processes to achieve them. A further purpose of National Sojourners is to oppose any influence whatsoever which would tend to weaken our national security. Under these standards, in recent conventions, National Sojourners has adopted resolutions opposing and reaffirming its opposition to the establishment of a world government or other type of supergovernment. National Sojourners opposes any attempt to extend additional power to the United Nations organization, however sincere the purposes might be, at the expense of weakening the security of the United States. National Sojourners, opposes any plan or proposal which would restrict or reduce in any way the sovereignty and independence of the United States. It is deeply convinced that many of the current plans and proposals would, if adopted, have that result and that they would retard rather than advance the very objectives sought to be accomplished by their proponents.

III. WORLD GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS

Proponents of plans for establishment of a world government recommend, among other things, that such a supergovernment be based upon the following principles: (1) That membership be open to all nations without the right of secession; (2) that world law should be enforceable directly upon individuals; and (3) that such a government should have direct taxing power independent of national taxation. They advocate that one of its powers should be a provision prohibiting the possession by any nation of armaments and forces beyond an approved level required for national policing.

These same advocates of world government have always attempted to achieve national approval of their plan in various State legislatures. Their approach at "grassroots" was their right under the Constitution, as one of the methods openly to accomplish the constitutional amendment necessary for their purpose. Their efforts quickly resulted in the adoption, by a large number of States of resolutions supporting this proposal, some of them requesting Congress to call a national convention to consider constitutional revision to permit world government. Since that time nearly all of these States have rescinded their resolutions, while other States have rejected proposals to adopt resolutions. This reversal has resulted from the opposition of the people when they became conscious of what was being developed, contrary to their will and detrimental to their best interests. As a consequence of this, the strategy of proponents of world government has now been revised, and among many of them there is the belief that their purpose can gradually be accomplished through revision of the United Nations Charter, without the necessity for amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

IV. PROPOSALS TO REVISE THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

National Sojourners believes that at the time of the next conference of the General Assembly, our political leaders will be urged to stand for: (1) An elimination of, or restriction, upon the veto power; (2) the admission to membership in the United Nations of all nations, regardless of the principles under which they are governed; (3) the establishment of so-called world law, enforceable directly upon individuals; (4) to vest in a world organization power to tax; (5) the power to establish, maintain, and use military forces to enforce world law with a prohibition against the maintenance of such forces by sovereign nations, except for national policing purposes; and (6) the adoption of a convention of human rights.

In discussion of the veto power we must recognize it as the keystone of the arch of sovereign independence of the various nations of the United Nations. If exercised wisely and with justice, it is an aid rather than a detriment, to international progress. Any elimination or restriction of its proper use in the national interest would cause a relinquishment of the rights of our citizens guaranteed

by the Constitution. It would vest authority in the United Nations organization, under certain circumstances to subjugate our country to determinations in governmental matters by foreign nations, many of which are now unable to govern themselves under democratic principles comparable to our own.

National Sojourners believes that the United States should not be willing to give up the veto power, since it would allow use of American armed forces without our consent.

National Sojourners believes that the United States should not relinquish the veto power with respect to the admission of new members to the United Nations. National Sojourners believes that the United States should not be willing to give up the veto power with respect to the international control of atomic energy. National Sojourners believes that the veto power should be retained for all those occasions when the United States finds itself at variance with the views of the Council's majority, since the veto, whether used or not, offers a safeguard to the American position. Abolition of the veto would mean giving up the safeguard in matters which heretofore have been considered the exclusive concern of the Nation. The Security Council, for example, could order the armed forces of member nations into action provided the military agreements envisioned in article 43 were concluded. If the veto were abolished, United States troops might conceivably be called upon to support a United Nations decision which the United States opposed.

Concern regarding the veto power cannot reasonably result from dissatisfaction as to its existence, but can and should stem only from its improper use.

We maintain that it is not evil, but that it is our most valuable sovereign right and the basis upon which our independence and security rests. Efforts to limit its abuse should be made through persuasion and no elimination or restriction can be countenanced.

National Sojourners assumes an unalterable position with regard to the veto power.

National Sojourners believes that nations of the world should not, merely because they have reasonably stable governments, be admitted into the United Nations organization regardless of the political principles under which they are governed.

It is of interest to note that the Soviet nations have vetoed the admission of some 14 prospective member nations, which might otherwise have been admitted to the United Nations, and that the United States and other nations have opposed the admission of the mainland government of China.

It is of further interest to note that in the consideration of applications of territories for admission to statehood in the United States, our Constitution requires that they have a republican form of government.

National Sojourners assumes position against the establishment of any world law enforceable upon individuals, since any such proposal presupposes the establishment of international courts with criminal jurisdiction; the enactment of a body of international laws defining new offenses; and the trial of alleged offenders under an international system which would differ from and deprive our citizens of the "due processes" guaranteed under our Bill of Rights. We oppose any such suggestion.

National Sojourners is unalterably opposed to any provision for the power to tax, by any world federal government.

National Sojourners is opposed to any proposal that the United Nations should be empowered to raise, maintain and use a world military force which might well be used against us or against our own national interests. We are further against any suggestion that sovereign nations be prohibited from maintaining independent national forces of their own except for police purposes. It is of interest to note that at present there are provisions for the contribution of military forces to the United Nations for "police" purposes. Under this present system, it has been demonstrated in the recent Korean conflict that the United States and the Republic of Korea (which was not a member nation) contributed more than 95 percent of the total men and resources used in this "police" action. It would appear that this were not an equitable contribution of such when it is considered in the light of an effort by a United Nation's force and to attain United Nations objectives.

National Sojourners is opposed to the proposed convention on human rights, which purports to establish something comparable to our Bill of Rights, and which if adopted, it would supersede. It is particularly repugnant because it does not contain a protection against the taking of private property without "due process of law" which our 5th and 14th amendments guarantee. It is further repugnant in that it would create rights without recognition of obligations.

V. SUMMARY

It appears clear that there are those, many of whom have the best of intentions, who would involve the United States in a world government or other type of supergovernment.

In the main they are the same groups and individuals who oppose an amendment to our Constitution to protect our internal law against encroachment by treaty or Executive agreement. We support such an amendment.

Those who oppose it, since its purpose is solely to protect our domestic affairs, should be asked what it is they seek to regulate through international agreement which might even be beyond the powers of our own Federal Government as granted it by the Constitution.

VI. CONCLUSION

National Sojourners, consistent with its recognized patriotic purposes and its opposition to any form of world or other supergovernment, urges the rejection by our Government of the various proposals which would alter the United Nations Charter so as to abolish or restrict the sovereignty and independence of the United States, as being detrimental to the security of our country.

Such plans are, likewise, opposed by many organizations in this country, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Order of the World Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Sons of the American Revolution, to mention a few, and we are convinced that they are opposed by the vast majority of our citizens.

Our leaders, and we as individuals, should be constantly aware of the dangers which beset us. We should be vigilant to guard against the entrapment of our country in the pursuit of elusive panaceas of false prophets, lest constitutional government become a mere memory in America.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Edward V. Dunklee.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Dunklee, the next witness will be Mrs. Carol Ehrlich.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD V. DUNKLEE, PRESIDENT, UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE FOR COLORADO

Mr. DUNKLEE. My name is Edward V. Dunklee. I am an attorney and president of the United Nations Committee for Colorado and of the Colorado branch of the American Association of United Nations, with offices at 812 E and C Building, Denver, Colo. I wish to make three points before this committee which we so much appreciate coming to our fair city as our guests.

CHARTER REVIEW BACKED

First, as to a charter review, I believe it is a good thing to pause once in a while and evaluate any system that we may have, but I think such evaluation should be one that is fair and appreciative of what has actually been done and in a climate in this case, that understands the needs of humanity all over the world. I respectfully submit that a good American does not limit his thinking or interest to the boundaries of this country, but that he is appreciative enough of the privileges of opportunity and health and happiness in this country to want to share them with others. I submit that the United Nations does just this.

It is not a world government. No sovereignty is granted to the United Nations by any country.

If we are to proceed on the foundation of hatred, suspicion, and dislike of the other people of the world, I submit that this conference would not be worthwhile and could gain nothing.

The United Nations Charter very much resembles our own Constitution and has proved pliable and workable to a degree unexpected by its founders—the best example being that when united and collective action was needed in Korea that the power of decision was shifted within the framework of the charter from the Security Council to the General Assembly. Since that time the General Assembly has become the world town meeting in which every nation may—almost too freely—express itself. Therefore, we are not dealing with a hidebound and straitjacketed charter, but one concerning which we can devote our talents to figuring out a way to act within the charter rather than to destroy it.

SUGGESTIONS SHOULD BE CONSTRUCTIVE

Second, this does not mean that the charter is perfect by any means. It must not be forgotten that the veto was primarily demanded by the United States and that although it has been a stumbling block, it has not prevented action, and the United Nations time after time has prevented war.

We do not want to throw out the baby with the bath water in seeking to cure, nor do we want to go back 10 years and destroy all the benefits of United Nations. That is why it is so important that suggestions should be constructive and ways and means found to bring them about within the framework of the charter if possible.

As to the specific suggestions as to how to proceed on three of the main questions which will arise. I am instructed to report that our organizations conclude as follows:

(a) Greater universality of membership which will include small nations which have made application. Our conclusion on this matter is that we regret that they have not been admitted to date, but that we should make a greater effort toward their admission within the framework of the charter, which provides that the General Assembly could pass upon these applications, if from countries willing to assume the obligations of the United Nations.

(b) The second point that will be raised is that matter of the veto and on this subject our groups deplore the misuse of the veto by Russia. We, however, recognize that the veto is not the main cause of world unrest, but rather the differences of ideologies between the East and the West. If some field of agreement can be found here, we believe that the veto difficulty can be solved within the framework of the charter. We recommend particularly the abolition of the veto on admission of new members and peaceful settlements of international disputes.

(c) The third suggestion consists of an enthusiastic approval of the "atoms for peace" program and the work of the combined commission in handling this activity. We would approve a new agency if necessary to handle the whole subject of atomic energy and to recognize it along with the 17 other agencies of the United Nations. And incidentally, we are against the Bricker amendment 100 percent.

I have just returned from a third trip on technical assistance, others being through the Caribbean, Europe, and the Middle East, and now from Central America to visit the projects under that agency. I found that this work alone, to say nothing of the other agencies, is

well worth retaining the United Nations for. The spirit of gratitude and appreciation among these other countries is unquestionable, and for the sake of those who worry about the money spent, I might call their attention to the fact that about all the United Nations furnishes is the know-how, and teaching the people to stand on their own feet. We must remember that the nations so helped, petition for those and pay one-half of the cost of the work before it begins. And this type of work covers disease control, great irrigation dams, agricultural projects, new fisheries, educational projects, and public administration, all of which breed international good will and prosperity. When the projects are finished, arrangements are made for the payment of the other half.

Let us save for our posterity the greatest promise we have gained during our generation.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Dunklee, as the head of the United Nations Committee for Colorado, you have testified that you believe in universal membership. Do you believe that a nation admitted to membership should have an obligation to conform with the charter?

Mr. DUNKLEE. I certainly do. I mean a greater universality of membership among nations which have applied and which will assume the obligations of responsibilities of the United Nations, that is, in favor of the free world.

Senator KNOWLAND. Has your association taken any position relative to the admission of Communist China?

Mr. DUNKLEE. Their answer to that is this: It is not the question, in our opinion, of the admission of China. She is already a member. But rather it is a question of the credentials, whether we should accept the credentials of Red China or the credentials of the Nationalists.

Senator KNOWLAND. Has it taken any position in regard to that?

Mr. DUNKLEE. They have not, except to say that they would accept, as far as advised, the credentials up to date of nationalistic China, the nationalist China, Chiang Kai-shek, for the reasons that Red China has so flouted the ideals and purposes of the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. Do you believe that a nation which has gained membership and has violated the charter should be subject to expulsion?

Mr. DUNKLEE. I think that there should be some rule in regard to that, but that can again be within the framework of the charter, and if the town meeting, that is, the General Assembly, so see fit to vote, that they should be allowed to vote; yes, sir.

EXPULSION OF CHARTER VIOLATORS DISCUSSED

Senator KNOWLAND. Do you understand that under the charter as it now stands, the Soviet Union could exercise a veto over expulsion?

Mr. DUNKLEE. Yes; I understand it.

Senator KNOWLAND. You are familiar with the fact, are you, that the Soviet Union admitted in the General Assembly meeting that they had supplied the MIG planes, the tanks, the guns, and the ammunition

to commit aggression in Korea and to help inflict 140,000 casualties upon us, including 35,000 dead?

Mr. DUNKLEE. Yes. That is not within the spirit and purposes of the United Nations, or assuming any of the obligations that I think a nation should assume.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that you would modify your proposal, or at least clarify it to mean that membership would be limited to those nations which would conform with the charter?

Mr. DUNKLEE. Yes; I do.

Senator KNOWLAND. And if a nation did have membership and flouted the charter, some provision should be made so that they could be expelled?

Mr. DUNKLEE. That is right.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

CHARTER WORKABLE AS IS

Senator SPARKMAN. May I ask you this question? If I understand your position correctly, it is this: that while you would be in favor of a review, and think some good might be accomplished, you think that most of our difficulties can be worked out within the present charter?

Mr. DUNKLEE. Yes, I do, and that is my main point. That is really why I am appearing here. I think that so many of these things will be of value because they are called attention to by your honorable committee here. The people are beginning to think about this matter. They have been international-minded here in Denver, but I think this is the height, right tonight. And I think that when these things are called attention to, many of them will be worked out within the framework of the charter. And that is what I favor.

Senator SPARKMAN. You still, however, would favor a conference for a thorough discussion and airing before the world?

Mr. DUNKLEE. Yes. I don't think a conference will hurt. I am afraid if we do not have it, there will be propaganda of Russian that we are afraid to have it, and I would rather have a frank and open discussion of everything, with cards above the table.

That has been the policy of the United States, and if we cannot face opposition and reason it down, there is something wrong. I am willing to do that. I think we had better go to bat on the proposition. But personally I think that if nothing comes of it, it still will be of great value on account of the discussion and the understanding that were the result of the United Nations Charter and the purposes.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Dunklee.

Mrs. Ehrlich.

Mr. GOOD. After Mrs. Ehrlich, the next witness will be Mr. David Pate.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you with us, Mrs. Ehrlich. Just have a seat and proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CAROL EHRLICH, PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, UNITARIAN CHURCH, DENVER, COLO

Mrs. EHRLICH. Thank you.

I am Carol H. Ehrlich. My address is 1826 South Dallas, Denver 22, and I am a housewife.

The report I will submit to this hearing is a result of study made by the public affairs committee of the Unitarian Church of Denver. This committee does not have a prescribed or set membership, but is rather a group outlet for individual members or friends of the Unitarian Church who wish to pursue topics of public interest with an eye toward self-education and/or group action.

The individuals who authorized this particular report number 25.

May I add, Senators, that we are grateful for the privilege of being here.

We have studied the question of revising the United Nations Charter and would like to make the following recommendations:

MEMBERSHIP PROVISIONS

On the question of membership, we think that the 21 nations which have already applied for membership in the United Nations should be admitted as a block. We believe that for utmost effectiveness the ultimate aim of the United Nations should be for universality of membership.

Also, some clear-cut policy should be formulated concerning the seating of the representative of de facto governments when the government of any member nation changes hands other than by orderly means. In this manner the United Nations would be able to work from a consistent position.

DISARMAMENT AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Regarding disarmament, we realize the United Nations Charter does not contemplate total and general disarmament, but covers regulation of armaments. Since the continued meetings of the Disarmament Commission and its subcommittee have shown progress, we believe it would be well not to try to alter the United Nations Charter on this question, but to urge the Commission to attack the problem with renewed vigor and with a real spirit of cooperation and compromise in an effort to complete their work for an enforceable world disarmament program. We commend the excellent step taken in this direction by the President in establishing the position of Secretary of Disarmament, with Cabinet rank.

In the matter of pacific settlement of disputes, a change in the charter has already been made by resolution without a formal conference—that is the Uniting for Peace Resolution introduced by the United States in 1950 which circumvents the use of the veto in the Security Council in matters involving peace and security. In the event of a veto in the Security Council the General Assembly can now meet within 24 hours and by a two-thirds vote recommend collective action against an aggressor. Of course, the General Assembly can only make recommendations; it has no power to take action, but the moral pressure of a large number of the nations making such recommendations can have an important effect.

VETO LIMITATIONS

There has been some disagreement in the Security Council over what constitutes matters of procedure, which are not subject to veto. There should be a clarification made by the General Assembly on what

constitutes procedural matters and what are the limitations of the veto in such matters.

In the matter of membership and the pacific settlement of disputes the thing which has caused much of the trouble is the veto power. However, since the Soviet Union has used the veto most often in these matters, it is doubtful that her representative would vote for a change concerning the veto in these areas without our willingness to give up the use of the veto in other areas. The Uniting for Peace Resolution mentioned before has circumvented the use of the veto in the peaceful settlement of disputes; so we suggest our own Government not press too strongly for revision centering around the veto power.

The objectives of the United Nations are to secure and maintain the peace and to create conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. In the past 10 years the United Nations has done much to secure peaceful settlement of disputes. With regard to the second objective, much also has been done through the 22 specialized agencies.

These agencies work on the common problems of all nations: of food, shelter, health, education, and other conditions under which peace can grow. Three conventions have been ratified—the Conventions on Genocide, on the Political Rights of Women, and on Refugees. The Declaration of Human Rights has been drafted; many of its provisions have already been incorporated into the constitutions of nations both in and out of the U. N., and we will support our own Congress in the ratification of these documents. Peace is being built through the work of the specialized agencies.

CAUTION TOWARD CHARTER REVISION

Since there is a danger to the very existence of the United Nations by a drive to revise or amend the charter in the face of strong opposition, and, since without basic agreement among the big powers, a conference would be ineffective, it seems wiser to attempt revision not by conference in 1956 but by greater support, both moral and monetary, of the work of the specialized agencies and by gradual change through compromise and resolution as has been done during these first 10 years. This method would allow the charter to evolve naturally little by little, case by case, to suit any needs and to meet any emergencies rather than to attempt revision which might increase tensions and risk the loss of what we have already gained.

If, however, the tenth General Assembly should decide to hold a conference, we believe the conference should be used to review the present charter to see whether the members are living up to its provisions. The role of the United States in such a review should be to offer constructive suggestions for (1) making the U. N. work better under the present charter, and (2) revisions by resolutions which would be advantageous to both East and West, and therefore acceptable to both.

In the meantime, we must all redouble our efforts in supporting the United Nations. In this respect, we urge Congress to allocate the funds President Eisenhower has requested for the U. N. Our duty as citizens is an educational one. We encourage the use of all media to make known to everyone the very great things the United Nations is doing in its efforts to bring and security to all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

QUALIFICATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR MEMBERSHIP

Senator KNOWLAND. Mrs. Ehrlich, in regard to your third paragraph which states "some clear-cut policy should be formulated concerning the seating of the representatives of de facto governments," has your organization given any consideration to what that clear-cut policy might be?

Mrs. EHRLICH. There has been a considerable amount of discussion on the subject. We did not feel qualified to make a specific recommendation, but we felt it should be a democratically determined policy.

Senator KNOWLAND. Assuming that the United Nations had been in existence during World War II, which, of course, it was not—it came into being at the end of the World War—the mere fact that Nazi Germany, for instance, had overrun Holland, Belgium, and France and had established Nazi-dominated governments in those countries, should not have entitled the de facto authority in those nations to sit as members of the U. N. do you think?

Mrs. EHRLICH. I would prefer not to answer that personally. I don't know just what the committee as a whole would feel on it. I think the committee I represent would want the General Assembly to determine that, by a democratic consensus.

Senator KNOWLAND. I want to explore this with you, because this is very pertinent. We had governments destroyed by Nazi dictatorships during the period of time. We now have the same problem with Communist dictatorships.

Now, de facto control can be established by armed forces overturning the legally constituted government of a country. For instances, before a country like China, where Communist military force had destroyed the established government, could be expected to gain membership, there might be a provision made for a U. N.-supervised election to find out what government the people really wanted.

Mrs. EHRLICH. Senator Knowland, I am afraid I can't answer that question directly. The point the group wished to make on this was that it should not be determined on the basis of individual cases, but rather on the basis of a set procedure, which has been arrived at through a democratic process within the Assembly. If you had a set procedure——

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, within the Assembly or within the country concerned?

Mrs. EHRLICH. Well, the procedure would be a set of criteria to determine which nation shall be admitted and which nation shall not be admitted, on certification procedures.

Senator KNOWLAND. Don't you think it is just as important that the people of the country who maybe had their legal government destroyed, should have some voice in who would represent them?

Mrs. EHRLICH. That I would have to answer as a personal opinion, and I don't feel that I am authorized to do that this evening.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Ehrlich.

Mr. Pate.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Pate, the next witness will be Mr. Charles Brannan.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Mr. Pate.

Mr. PATE. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DAVID PATE, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. PATE. Gentlemen, my name is David Pate. I am 32 years of age, and was educated in the Denver public schools and at the University of Stanford. I am a businessman and I speak for myself.

On the 10th anniversary of the conception of the United Nations, a realistic appraisal cannot but conclude that the United Nations has been a failure, based on its original objectives to save the people of the world from the scourge of war and to take effective collective measures against aggression.

UNITED STATES—U. S. S. R. COOPERATION CONSIDERED IMPOSSIBLE

Herbert Hoover exhibited profound foresight when in 1941 he said:

To align American ideals alongside Stalin will be as great a violation of everything American as to align ourselves with Hitler * * * Such an alliance will bring sad retributions to our people * * * We will help Stalin to survive and continue his terror and his conspiracies against all democracies.

Nine years later, Mr. Hoover stated in another speech, just before Korea:

The Kremlin has reduced the United Nations to a propaganda forum for the smearing of freedom. It has been defeated in its major purpose as a maker of peace and good will.

In July, after Korea, Mr. Hoover had this to say:

Today, our hopes of lasting peace lie in a new direction of national policies. The first of these is to reorganize the United Nations.

In December of 1951, with continuing clairvoyance, Mr. Hoover stated:

Our great hope was in the United Nations. We have witnessed a sabotage of its primary purpose of preserving peace. It has been, down to the last week, a forum for continuous smear on our honor, our ideals and purposes.

The soundness of Mr. Hoover's moral, spiritual, and realistic appraisals cannot be challenged.

It is an illusion of gargantuan proportion to suggest in the light of history or of the present day that America and the Soviet Union can cooperate. The illusion started in 1933 with the recognition of Soviet Russia, and found its most monstrous expression at Yalta and in the birth of the U. N. with Russia as one of the dominant figures.

On the pitiful backdrop of some hundreds of thousands of American boys dead or wounded in Korea, of the U. N.'s unfulfilled demand for unification of Korea, of a truce commission composed of Poland, Czechoslovakia, India, Sweden, and Switzerland, of the many violations of the truce by Red China, and the abandonment of American soldiers in Red jails, let us look further at the United Nations.

U. N. TREATIES CRITICIZED

Its greatest dangers to America are its resolutions to which America is asked to subscribe, which are so often at variance with our Constitution, and could override our Constitution if passed by the Senate.

Fortunately, our United States Senate has pigeonholed the genocide convention and the U. N. Covenant on Human Rights.

Mr. Frank Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, speaking about the U. N. Commission on Human Rights, said this:

It is of utmost importance to note that again and again the Commission on Human Rights has refused to approve the inclusion in the covenant of a provision covering the basic American right to own property and be secure in its enjoyment against its arbitrary seizure by government. This refusal of itself discloses and proves the extent to which the commission is controlled by Communists and international Socialists.

In a separate paper to this committee I have dealt briefly with other subagencies and activities of the U. N., such as the UNESCO program, already barred in Los Angeles by the board of education; also the ILO, which according to our 1954 delegate to its convention, is promoting socialism.

WITHDRAWAL FROM U. N. ADVOCATED

Speaking as an individual, I advocate withdrawal of the United States from the U. N., coincident with termination of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Let us continue to build a united front against communism with those countries willing to defend the peace with more than high-sounding phrases, while at the same time respecting their sovereign rights as we would have them respect ours.

If the American people want world government let them vote on the question, rather than having it voted in through the back door by U. N. treaties. The greatest hope left in the world today for peace is a strong and free America.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Pate, you may be interested to know that former President Hoover is going to testify before our committee about the 20th, I believe it is. During that week it will be interesting to see what his comments may be.

Mr. PATE. I will look forward to them; yes, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. PATE. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Pate is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF DAVID F. PATE

Only a realistic, unemotional appraisal of the United Nations is fair to the United States of America and to those nations who have contributed morally, physically, and financially to its original aims. Such an appraisal, on the 10th anniversary of its conception, cannot but conclude that the United Nations has been a failure, based on its initial objectives as presented to the people of America.

The Charter of the United Nations, and the presentation of its concepts to the American citizen, expressed the foremost determination to "save" the people of the world from the "scourage of war," "to take effective collective measures" against aggression, and to "practice tolerance and live together in peace." No one could have wished for a worthier goal.

Article 42 of the United Nations Charter deals with the enforcement of the preservation of peace. It provides the Security Council "may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations." The sincerity and effectiveness of these statements can be tested by the results in Korea, Indochina, Pakistan, Greece, Palestine, and China.

If such noble statements and covenants are to be value as more than empty phrases, why has it been necessary for this country to enter NATO, SEATO, and other alliances outside the U. N.? Why is it necessary that we have hundreds

of overseas airbases? These things are evidences and open admissions of lack of faith in the integrity and ability of the United Nations themselves to preserve the peace—and justifiably so.

It is an illusion of gross proportion to suggest in the light of history or of the present day that America and the Soviet Union can cooperate. This illusion started in 1933 with the recognition of Soviet Russia. It reached its height at Yalta and in the origination of the U. N. with Russia as one of the dominant figures. It continues even in 1955 with the suggestion of certain United States Senators for a Big Four meeting.

Other than the world Socialists and some namby-pambies, there is a clique in this country and abroad who say that those who criticize Yalta and the United Nations exhibit hindsight, not foresight. Memories are indeed short. People blind to realities do not like to remember the accurate prophecies of the late Senator Taft and the great humanitarian, Herbert Hoover.

Who in this country remembers Herbert Hoover's speech of June 29, 1941? I quote:

"Collaboration between Britain and Russia will bring them military values, but it makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the four freedoms to mankind a gargantuan jest * * *. We should refresh our memories a little * * * to aline American ideals alongside Stalin will be as great a violation of everything American as to aline ourselves with Hitler. Can the American people debauch their sense of moral values and the very essence of their freedom by even a tacit alliance with Soviet Russia? Such an alliance will bring sad retributions to our people. If we go into this war we will aid Stalin to hold his aggression against the four little democracies. We will help him to survive and continue his terror and his conspiracies against all democracies. We should stop the chant about leading the world to liberalism and freedom. Again I say, if we join the war and Stalin wins, we have aided him to impose more communism on Europe and the world. At least we could not with such a bedfellow say to our sons that by making the supreme sacrifice, they are restoring freedom to the world. War alongside Stalin to impose freedom is more than a travesty. It is a tragedy."

Nine years later Mr. Hoover spoke again. It was April 1950. Bear in mind this was pre-Korea. I quote:

"I need not remind you that our page 1 international issue is Communist Russia. There are seven phases of this experience which I must recall before I come to a proposal of action * * *. The fifth phase of this experience has been with the Communists in the United Nations. That charter for which we hoped so much contains lengthy pledges to the independence of nations, to human liberty and nonaggression. About a dozen provisions of that charter have been violated either in spirit or in letter by Soviet Russia. The Kremlin has reduced the United Nations to a propaganda forum for the smearing of free people. It has been defeated in its major purpose as a maker of peace and good will. * * * I suggest that the United Nations be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impractical, then a definite New United Front should be organized of those people who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom."

On July 11, 1950, after the Communist attack on Korea, Mr. Hoover had this to add in another speech:

"Today, our hopes of lasting peace lie in a new direction of national policies. The first of these is to reorganize the United Nations. * * * We cannot successfully cope with present world problems or secure a lasting peace without consistent and clearly defined policies and objectives which we are prepared to support and defend."

Only a month after Korea, Mr. Hoover had warned the U. N. of the results of vacillation and weakness. Again he was ignored.

On October 19, 1950, again Mr. Hoover spoke, but his clairvoyance was to no avail: "There is a stern lesson for the American people from these 17 years of experience" (1933-50). Referring to the Russians, Mr. Hoover continued, "Every American who has tried to deal with them has come away with his face and hands smeared with red tar. Every time our Government has attempted to cooperate with them, we have become involved in a morass of lost statesmanship." Speaking of chapter VII of the U. N. Charter which "is a specific agreement as to mobilization of effective military and economic forces from every member to stop aggression," Mr. Hoover continued:

"To get action, either the potency and organization of the U. N. under chapter VII should be so restored, notwithstanding Russian obstruction, as to take over

a real job, or alternatively, we should enlarge the North Atlantic Alliance into a world alliance which could in this fashion execute chapter VII of the charter."

In case memories continue to be short, let it be said that Mr. Hoover's fourth speech of 1950, December 20, was occasioned by the failure of the United Nations to mobilize the military strength of non-Communist countries, and the continued failure of European countries to respond to their own needed defense. I quote sections from this magnificent speech:

"We may also appraise the diplomatic front. Our great hope was in the United Nations. We have witnessed the sabotage of its primary purpose of preserving peace. It has been, down to the last week, a forum for continuous smear on our honor, our ideals and purposes."

The soundness of Mr. Hoover's moral, spiritual, and realistic appraisals cannot be challenged. It should be obvious to any reasonable person that it is futile and even dangerous to use the U. N. as a military alliance, a preserver of the peace, or as a perverter of aggression.

On the pitiful backdrop of some hundreds of thousands of American boys dead or wounded in Korea, of the U. N.'s unfulfilled demand for unification of Korea, of a truce commission composed of Poland, Czechoslovakia, India, Sweden, and Switzerland, of the many violations of the truce by Red China, and the abandonment of American soldiers in Red jails, let us look further at the United Nations.

Of even greater potential damage and danger to the United States than that previously mentioned, is the strong tendency within and without the United Nations to write treaties and international commitments that override our Constitution. Many will remember that when President Truman seized the steel mills after the Korean war started, he was supported by three members of the United States Supreme Court in that action, though it was in clear violation of our Constitution. Though this was fortunately a minority opinion, the Justices cited the United Nations Charter as authorization for President Truman to "take any and every action he alone thought wise to render that assistance" (that assistance referring to the repelling of aggression in Korea).

Among other treaties which have been drawn up within the United Nations that would impair our basic individual rights are the Genocide Convention, adopted by the General Assembly in Paris in 1948, and the International Covenant on Human Rights. Fortunately the Genocide Convention was pigeonholed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It has not been ratified, but there is always the possibility it may be at a future date. Fortunately, as Mr. Frank Holman has stated, the American Bar Association of which he is a past president, "pointed out the serious dangers and loopholes in its content and also the failure of its language to include 'genocide' committed by governments, as for example the liquidation of racial and other groups in Russia and Russian satellite countries by merely calling them political groups or enemies of the State. At Russia's insistence all reference to 'political' groups was eliminated from the final text. It was established that the document was so badly drawn as to endanger American basic rights."¹

As to the International Covenant on Human Rights, the material relevant to its danger to America is voluminous. In 1946, the Commission on Human Rights was established as a subagency of the Economic and Social Council. In 1947, this Commission announced that it proposed to draft two documents: A Declaration of Human Rights and a Covenant on Human Rights. The covenant was in the nature of a treaty, to be ratified by participating U. N. countries. The purpose of this proposal was to establish "for all peoples of the world a uniform system of individual rights regardless of the nature and character of such rights as already established by the national law and usage in each particular country."

The first Director of the Commission, Mr. John P. Humphrey, publicly declared:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore, a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens."¹

This statement of proposal was in direct violation of article 2, subparagraph 7 of the U. N. Charter. This states that "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are

¹ Freeman magazine, March 1955.

essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter."² I would like to quote a few statements by Mr. Frank Holman, regarding this Commission.

"It is of utmost importance to note that again and again the Commission on Human Rights has refused to approve the inclusion in the Covenant of a provision covering the basic American right to own private property and be secure in its enjoyment against its arbitrary seizure by government. This refusal of itself discloses and proves the extent to which the Commission is controlled by Communists and international Socialists. On March 3, 1954, over only United States and Turkish objections, the 18-nation Commission voted to shelve indefinitely all discussion of property rights * * *"

The Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, Charles Malik of Lebanon, had this to say of the Commission's Socialist and Communist approach to its work:

"I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts examined responded for the most part more to Soviet than to Western promptings."¹

Speaking further of the substance contained in U. N. treaty proposals, Mr. Holman says:

"They cover matters of education, the kind of teaching and textbook to be adopted in our public-school systems; social legislation; health and socialized medicine; and numerous other matters, including a proposal to establish an international criminal court to try American citizens in a court made up to a large extent, if not entirely, of foreigners, a plan under which American citizens could be transported overseas for trial and would be deprived of the safeguards accorded them in the Constitution of this country."¹

William Henry Chamberlain, distinguished author and historian, has this to say about the United Nations Covenant of Human Rights:

"The tone and substance of resolutions to which the United States, as a U. N. member, is invited to subscribe are often at variance with the principles of the American Constitution. Basic human liberties, such as freedom of religion, of speech and press, are treated in the U. N. Covenant on Human Rights as something which governments may grant, limit, or abrogate. The historical American view is that these are natural rights of human beings under God, with which no government can tamper. The difference is important."²

Continuing, Mr. Chamberlain says: "The United States is in a minority of 'haves' surrounded by a majority of 'have nots' in the U. N. The Economic and Social Council of the U. N. is a fertile breeding ground for schemes designed to transfer American wealth, under one pretext or another, to underprivileged nations. On one occasion, the United States representative was in a minority of one in standing for the principle that private property should not be confiscated without adequate compensation."¹ Mr. Chamberlain continues further by stating that "there is a continuous pressure, supported by some misguided Americans, for transforming the United Nations into a world government. On the day when this would happen all constitutional defenses of our political and economic liberties would fall."¹

In an appraisal of the U. N., a few comments should be made about UNESCO, one of the many specialized agencies of the United Nations. A United States Appropriations Subcommittee reported to the Senate on June 26, 1952, as follows: "The subcommittee heard a great deal of testimony (on UNESCO) relative to a very clever propaganda campaign to sell the people of this country, and particularly the school children, the doctrine of one-world government and world citizenship." UNESCO's own informational brochures confirm this Senate report, for its states:

"Activities designed to promote education for living in a world community relate to the healthy social and mental development of children, through education, the improvement of programs, textbooks, and other teaching materials, teaching about the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the association of young people with the world of UNESCO."

It should be pointed out that those of us who oppose UNESCO do not feel that our children should be prevented from knowing what this agency is, but we certainly can fight indoctrination by and for UNESCO.

² U. N. Charter.

¹ Freeman magazine, March 1955.

In one of the UNESCO teacher-training booklets entitled, "In the Classroom With Children Under 13 Years of Age," it states: "These earlier years may be indispensable to the education of children for world citizenship." In its own words, UNESCO would attempt to "correct many of the errors of home training," as if it were indeed endowed with the rights to judge the errors of families in raising their own children.

Let people think that there is little opposition to UNESCO, it should be pointed out that the city of Los Angeles rejected UNESCO meddling in its school system. The Los Angeles Board of Education on January 20, 1952, voted that there should be "no official or unofficial UNESCO program in the Los Angeles city schools, and the UNESCO chairmanships and central advisory committee shall be abolished." The California legislature followed suit with legislation banning UNESCO programs.

The purposes of brevity, there is much left unsaid, in this paper about other activities of the U. N. which are a detriment to the basic concepts of individual freedom as known to most Americans: detriments to American security; and to its general welfare. For example, the review of those Americans who found employment in the United Nations about whom there was a reasonable doubt regarding their loyalty; about the promotion of socialism through the International Labor Organization, a warning coming directly from Mr. W. L. McGrath, a member of the ILO governing boards, and the United States employer delegate at the ILO 1954 conference; and about the Guatemalan revolution where Colonel Armas, fortunately for the free nations, ignored the U. N. cry for "all members of the United Nations to abstain from rendering assistance"¹ to action which would cause bloodshed, thereby preventing his country from becoming a Soviet satellite. One could write an encyclopedia on the U. N. so vast are its programs and entanglements.

With due respect to the genuine humanitarians in the U. N., the fundamental undertones and overtones of the U. N. are clear. Where it has been lacking in its zealousness to keep the peace, it has not been wanting in enthusiasm to create world socialism. By its very coercive and intervening nature, the U. N. will continue to cause friction, between nations, and among peoples within nations. Nor would it, or can it be, an instrument for general good even if it accepts American principles under coercion. The United States Government cannot morally justify its diplomatic association with the Soviet Union, within or without the U. N. This is in keeping with the United States Senate's unanimous resolution opposing the seating of its copartner and fellow gangster, Red China.

As just one private citizen of millions, I advocate withdrawal of the United States from the U. N., coincident with termination of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites by our Government. Such a move will disentangle us from the largest and most dangerous bureaucracy created by man. If the American people want world government, let them vote on the question, rather than having it voted in through the back door via U. N. treaties. The greatest hope left in the world today for peace is a strong America. It did not achieve its strength, nor can it maintain its stamina, through emulation of Socialist doctrines. Let us continue a united front against communism with those countries who are anti-Communist and with any nation that will defend the peace with more than high-sounding phrases. America's door will always be open to men of sincere good will.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Brannan.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Brannan, the next witness will be Mrs. Waller C. Brinker.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you.

Mr. BRANNAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES F. BRANNAN, GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Charles F. Brannan, general counsel, National Farmers Union, a farm organization composed of some 265,000 farm families, and

¹ Freeman magazine, March 1955.

appear for the purpose of presenting some views and suggestions on behalf of that organization.

We commend your committee for making the effort to hold this series of hearings at different points in the United States. We believe there is a great reservoir of good will among the farmers of this country for the United Nations organization and that they have a deep and abiding hope and faith in it for a permanent peace with justice and honor. The knotty problems of operation and the vexatious negotiations within the United Nations is a small cost to pay if it will help to delay or prevent the outbreak of any war, large or small.

SUPPORT AND STRENGTHEN THE U. N.

The United Nations is a going concern. It has done a great good during the first decade of its existence. The Farmers Union wants to see it maintained, strengthened, and wholeheartedly supported by the United States. Moves to strengthen the United Nations should be guided both by aspirations for its becoming a great force for world peace and development, and also by the awareness that we weaken rather than strengthen the United Nations by asking it to do more than at any given time it can reasonably be expected to do.

Our long-range objective can be no less than to strive for the earliest possible attainment of a democratic world brotherhood of nations living at peace with one another in a United Nations that derives its just powers from the people of the world and provides the basis and opportunity for constantly increased production and improved living standards. By "democratic" is meant, of course, the principles incorporated in the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

Of course, we realize that it will take a long time to reach this goal; but the goal should be kept in mind so that we shall not, from time to time, make well-intentioned but destructive moves that will slow down progress in the direction we want to go.

DEMOCRATIC WORLD ECONOMIC UNION

One of the interim goals for which we should aim is for the United States to combine with other democratic nations in establishing a democratic world economic union with broad powers to promote economic growth and development within the free world. Such a world economic union could be established, we believe, as a regional organization authorized by articles 52 and 54 of the United Nations Charter. However, if these articles can be construed not to provide the necessary authority, they should be so revised.

In the charter revision meeting the United States should indicate its desire to strengthen the United Nations and to make the charter revisions necessary to give it the power and authority to actually keep even a strong nation from starting a war. The United States during the meeting should give steadfast support to the idea of strengthening the United Nations as a forum wherein differences between nations can be settled by the democratic processes of negotiation, arbitration, and conciliation.

SPECIFIC REVISIONS SUBMITTED

We submit for your consideration the following specific revisions in the United Nations Charter, each of which is more fully developed in the supplementary statement before you, and which I respectfully request be made part of the record of this hearing to follow this oral presentation.

1. Since the United Nations is the only instrument now available for achieving nonviolent solutions to disputes among all nations, universality of membership should be its ultimate goal. The handling of the question of admission of new members by vote of the General Assembly would go far in overcoming the present situation.

2. Voting procedure in the General Assembly should be changed from the existing one-nation-one-vote system to a weighted voting system by genuinely sovereign nations which would recognize each sovereign state as such by a minimum vote and also take into account the relative population numbers for allocating additional votes within an arbitrary maximum.

3. General Assembly decisions on substantive as well as procedural matters should be made by simple majority of the total of the weighted votes.

4. Subsequent charter revisions should require a two-thirds approval of weighted votes.

5. The General Assembly, acting for the United Nations, should be empowered to enact laws to enforce disarmament on all nations by laws against manufacture or possession of weapons beyond those needed for maintaining domestic order.

6. In general, the jurisdiction of the International Court and the application of international law should be greatly extended and strengthened. It is our firm belief that only through the establishment of law and order, backed up by both moral and material sanctions, will peace eventually be achieved. We recognize the problems posed in enforcement, but believe that positive intermediary steps should be taken at this time through charter revision.

7. The Security Council should be reconstituted as a Peace Enforcement Council with power assigned by the General Assembly to carry out disarmament decisions and to recruit, train, and command the United Nations inspection and police force so that violations of disarmament and other decisions can be promptly detected and stopped.

8. If it does not now do so, the charter should be revised to authorize negotiation and establishment of a democratic world economic union.

9. India should be added as a permanent member of the recommended Peace Enforcement Council.

10. The powers of the Economic and Social Council should be revised to enable it to work out, establish, and operate an international food and raw materials reserve, in conjunction with the World Bank and International Monetary Fund; and also to activate and operate the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

It is the belief of the Farmers Union that these suggested revisions in the United Nations Charter would make measurable progress toward the ultimate attainment of a democratic brotherhood of nations.

It believes they are feasible within the context of our time. However, we would not urge any one of them to the point that a substantial number of nations would be driven out of the United Nations.

Whether or not the United States can obtain adoption of these suggested revisions, our Nation should nevertheless continue to support the United Nations and work along with it, gradually trying to improve it as time goes along.

Our major aims are permanent peace and rising standards of living. We are convinced that neither can be obtained without the other. We believe that a strengthened United Nations has a crucial role to play in the attainment of both peace and better living.

I appreciate this opportunity to present these views to you on this very important matter.

Senator SPARKMAN. Your supplement will be incorporated into the record.

Mr. BRANNAN. Thank you, sir.

(The supplement to the statement of Mr. Brannan is as follows:)

SUPPLEMENT TO STATEMENT BY CHARLES F. BRANNAN, FOR NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION, ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

The United Nations should be an organization to which all nations of the world can and will belong. This means that there are some powers the peace-loving democratic nations cannot turn over to the United Nations. This also means that charter revisions should not be made that will drive other nations out of the United Nations. Hence, the following elaboration upon the suggestions made orally, are tendered.

World Court and Police Force

Charter revision should include a specific definition of the nature and jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The revised charter should specify the powers residing in the United Nations to enforce disarmament on all nations alike by decisions against the manufacture or possession of weapons beyond those needed for maintaining domestic order. The strengthened U. N. should be empowered to recruit, train, and command its own inspection and police forces so that violations of U. N. disarmament decisions can be promptly detected and deterred.

International law and courts

(a) The jurisdiction of the Court should be extended to all cases unless one of the parties to the dispute should by notice to the Court withdraw a particular case from the jurisdiction of the Court. This would place the onus of withdrawing from the Court's jurisdiction upon the country which was unwilling to have the dispute aired before the Court.

(b) The scope of the advisory opinions to be handed down by the International Court could be greatly extended by a provision in the U. N. Charter.

(c) The world criminal courts should have jurisdiction over individuals in cases involving crimes in war and preparation for war, along the general lines already proposed by the International Law Commission.

(d) Additional lower courts should be established in order to hear disputes involving the international criminal code, as well as disputes involving individuals, and the charter so amended as to provide the right of appeal from such lower courts to the International Court of Justice.

Strengthen General Assembly

The General Assembly should be given all of the powers now assigned to the Security Council. The Security Council should be redesignated as the Peace Enforcement Council with responsibility to carry out the disarmament decisions as adopted by the revised General Assembly but the powers specified in articles 24 and 25 should be transferred from the Security Council to the General Assembly.

Revise voting procedure

Revision of the voting procedure of the strengthened General Assembly from the present 1-nation-1-vote system to a weighted system of voting along the following lines should be carefully examined:

Each genuinely sovereign nation should have a minimum voting strength of one vote plus additional votes in proportion to the relative population of the member nation but not to exceed a common maximum applicable to each nation. As an alternative to, or in addition to, the maximum allowed any one nation on the basis of population, consideration may well be given to average annual national gross product or income as another factor for fixing voting strength.

Two-thirds vote for charter revision

The charter should then be revised to provide that its future revisions can be enacted only by a two-thirds vote.

Peace Enforcement Council

The structure of the Security Council (to be renamed as the Peace Enforcement Council) should be continued about as now, with India to be named as a permanent member. The Council would have full authority to carry out decisions of the General Assembly but would not be empowered to override decisions of the General Assembly or to operate in absence of General Assembly decisions, except pending the next meeting of the General Assembly.

These suggested revisions move in the direction of the ultimate democratic world brotherhood of nations and the United States should work for as many of these revisions as it can within the limitation previously stated. The United States should also oppose any proposed revisions that would go in an opposite direction. But even if the suggested improvements cannot be negotiated at this time, the Farmers' Union believes that the United States should give the United Nations steadfast support and gradually try to make it stronger and more effective as time goes on.

Economic and Social Council

Just as the suggested Peace Enforcement Council would have enforcement and operating functions, so should the Economic and Social Council in its area of work. If required, the U. N. Charter should be revised to authorize the Economic and Social Council, in cooperation with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) and the International Monetary Fund to establish and operate an international food and raw materials reserve or bank of the type described in a bill introduced by more than 20 Senators and several Members of the House. The United States should, also, support rather than oppose the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) to be administered under the Economic and Social Council in cooperation with the World Bank.

Need for international economic cooperation

Faced with the problems of tariffs, low productivity, dollar shortages, embargoes, and other problems restricting sale of United States farm products in other countries, the United States can take the road of abundance or the road of scarcity.

The United States can go it alone: American markets for American goods; hold out competing imports, and give up foreign markets for United States production. If it does so the United States farmer will have to shift 50 million acres now producing wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, corn, soybeans, apples, and other commodities into production of something else that could be sold in the United States or take them out of production.

Large segments of United States industrial production would have to shut down, lay off workers, reduce consumer demand in the United States for farm commodities for lack of raw materials and lack of foreign markets.

Entire free world, including United States production and living standards, would be reduced. "Stomach communism" in many areas of the world would be promoted, a "Fortress America" would become inevitable.

The road to abundance is through negotiated international regulation of expanded international exchange of materials—greater international economic cooperation and coordination, preferably through international agreement and agencies comprised of many nations, or negotiated agreements with other nations, one at a time.

These include negotiation and establishment of (1) a World Economic Development Agency; (2) additional international commodity agreements such as the International Wheat Agreement for each and every raw material that enters importantly into international trade; (3) renewal of reciprocal trade agreement; (4) ratification of the General Agreements on Tariff and Trade (GATT); and (5) the proposed international food and raw materials reserve.

If these things are done, this would: (a) Encourage investments, (b) stabilize markets, (c) Promote increased production in all countries, (d) progressively reduce and ultimately eliminate famines, chronic undernutrition, low living standards, and (e) make possible the use of abundant food supplies to aid in establishment in the lesser developed area of the world a system of free schools for every child.

A serious gap now exists in present United States laws and international agreements.

There is no provision for international handling of interrelated financial and commodity market problems.

Thus, the United States with 7 percent of world's peoples, 30 percent of world's resources, but 74 percent of world's manufacturing is using up resources very rapidly and does not have a stabilized source of supply, while raw materials producing nations are still subject to wild ups and downs in world raw materials, markets, and monetary exchanges.

To meet these problems in a fundamental way, James G. Patton, of National Farmers' Union, has proposed establishment of a Democratic World Economic Union.

Democratic World Economic Union

This proposal for a Democratic World Economic Union as put forward by President James G. Patton, as a supplement to the United Nations, would provide for—

No trade barriers between member nations;

No immigration barriers;

All nations within the union would use same currency and have a combined central banking system;

Support by financial contributions of member nations on system based upon fiscal capacity, similar to United States income tax.

The governing body of the economic union would consist of three houses:

Overseers: Selected by governments of member nations apportioned according to national wealth and income.

Economic representatives: Elected by each nation in free elections by all citizens, apportioned on the basis of population.

Trustees: Elected by each nation in free elections by all citizens, apportioned one per nation.

Decisions of governing body would require agreement by the three houses, each of whose decisions would be taken by majority vote.

Functions of Democratic World Economic Union would be strictly defined by its charter and limited to the following:

Inaugurate programs to speed up the rate of economic development throughout the union.

Take actions to increase the productivity per man of human labor throughout the union.

Develop, conserve, and increase productivity of land, water, and other natural resources.

Work for gradual elimination of economic, social, and political institutions that slow down economic development.

Regulate the currency and banking system.

Eliminate trade and migration barriers among member nations.

Administrative agencies of DWEU would be established by charter and consist of monetary authority, external economic affairs department, economic development authority, atomic energy development authority, trade regulation and research and education agency.

International food and raw materials reserve

One necessary feature of international economic cooperation that should be instituted at the earliest possible moment is some international agency such as an international food and raw materials reserve to perform the following functions:

(a) Prevent extreme price fluctuations in the international market for food and other raw material and encourage expanding production in order to meet the world's increasing foodstuff and other raw material needs, both in terms of raising existing per person consumption and of future increased population;

(b) Maintain gainful employment not only in agricultural production, but also in those industries supplying agriculture and engaged in the processing and distribution of agricultural products and other raw materials;

(c) Absorb temporary market surpluses of food and other raw materials;

(d) Prevent famine and starvation; and

(e) Provide for a self-financing operation through the orderly international exchange of raw materials and through the development of an international program of loans for raw material development, and for corollary economic development.

Probably the most persistent, most disturbing and most perplexing of modern economic problems is the human suffering and relative stagnation enforced upon producers of raw materials by the extreme ups and downs in the prices of raw materials and consequently in their realized and expected incomes. The problem is serious in all the more highly developed nations. It is even more seriously present and damaging in the lesser developed nations.

Wide swings in raw materials prices present prospective investors in raw material development, whether persons, firms or states, with a very large range of variation in expectations as to returns that can be earned by opening up and developing an augmented raw material supply. This condition is one of great risks where at any moment not only might part of the investment be rendered valueless but earnable returns may even fail to cover day-to-day operating costs and the entire enterprise will have to be shut down with attendant loss of income and human suffering.

Faced with such great uncertainty in expectations both states and individuals are hesitant to open up or expand enterprises that are currently profitable but which may at any time dip drastically below the break-even line through no fault of the enterprise management itself. The multiplication of this kind of a situation throughout farming and all other raw materials industries puts a very severe damper upon the rate of economic development in these industries.

This slowing down of the rate of expansion in raw material industries not only reduces the supply of such materials to meet human needs and to fuel manufacturing and other secondary industries, it also holds down the purchasing power of persons and firms on the raw materials sector and thus cuts down on sales, scale of operation, and consequently of income and purchasing power of the industrial and service segments of the economy. Consequently, the entire economy idles along at a lower rate of production and expansion than needs to be the case. In the more highly industrialized nations the symptoms are seen in chronically depressed industries like farming and coal mining in the United States. Among the lesser industrialized nations, a drop in raw material prices can bring an entire nation dangerously close to bankruptcy and can directly cause a widespread drop in personal income and standards of living of the entire population.

It is only natural that the economic segments and nations involved in these debilitating circumstances would take evasion and protective action just as an intelligent bomber pilot takes evasive action from destructive antiaircraft fire.

Such protective or evasive action when taken unilaterally by different nations help to solve the problems caused by fluctuating raw material prices only at the cost of reducing the magnitude of international exchange of commodities and thus results in all nations losing the advantages of specialization. Everybody in all nations has less real income and a lower standard of living than they might otherwise be able to attain.

Through the administrative machinery of an international food and raw materials reserve, the stabilized prices of each different raw material that enters importantly into international trade would be negotiated and agreed upon. The reserve would thereafter stand ready at all times to buy any raw material commodity offered it at the agreed upon stabilized price and would stand ready to sell such commodities at the agreed upon stabilized price.

The industry of advanced nations is chewing up basic resources at a tremendous and rising rate. For example, the United States which has 7 percent of the world's population and 30 percent of the world's natural resources account for 70 percent of the world's manufactured goods. The United States is using up its resources base at a very rapid rate and very much faster than the rest of the world. To be secure in our rising living standards and to retain the resource base for an expanding economy, we must assure ourselves a stabilized source of supply of the raw materials for our manufacturing industry. The same situation is true in other industrious nations such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan. The thought-provoking details for different commodities were thoroughly considered in the Paley Report of several years ago.

Highly industrialized nations could depend entirely upon private industrial concerns to make long-term contracts with raw material producers in other lands. And, this should be done. But, it can only be successfully and securely accomplished under the protection and encouragement by governments and international economic accords.

These latter conceivably could be done exclusively through bilateral arrangements between the United States and foreign nations; one nation at a time, one commodity at a time. However, no supplier, private enterprise, or state, wants to become dependent exclusively on one buyer; nor does any importing nation or industrialist want to become dependent upon only one seller.

Through the international food and raw materials reserve, exporting nations can obtain assured long-term stabilized markets and importing nations can obtain an assured long-term ample supply at stabilized prices of imports on terms that will not injure domestic producers who must sell their commodities in competition with imports.

The international food and raw materials reserve would operate in coordination with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Many of the national restrictions we now have that hold down greater international exchange of commodities is the desire of nations to preserve their monetary position in different currencies particularly dollars and pounds sterling. The international food and raw materials reserve would completely eliminate this problem by operating in terms of all currencies on the basis of internationally agreed upon official exchange rates.

Permanent peace depends on international institutions that will promote more rapid economic growth

The international food and raw materials resolution has been before Congress for nearly 2 years and has been reintroduced this year in both Houses. The concepts involved in the resolution have their roots in the still-unsolved problems of extreme human need, starvation, economic stagnation, and poverty throughout the world in the midst of surpluses of raw materials that cannot be sold at prices that will return an adequate stable income to producers.

The genesis of the ideas are found in the efforts of the National Farmers Union of the United States to work out a solution to the farmers' income problem. Recommendations presented nearly 10 years ago to the International Federation of Agricultural Producers by National Farmers Union representatives were fully considered and favorably acted upon by this international private farm organization among whose members are all the national farm organizations of the United States.

The international food and raw materials resolution does not itself establish an international agency. The resolution merely calls upon the President to undertake negotiations with other nations to that end. Any agreements reached would, of course, be subject to review and ratification by the Senate of the United States and appropriation of any needed capital and other funds would have to be fully considered by both Houses.

The international food and raw materials reserve will help solve many of our Nation's most difficult problems of both domestic and foreign policy. It will make a major contribution toward permanent peace by facilitating a more rapid rate of economic expansion. Its operation will stabilize world raw material markets. It will put abundant production to work.

The proposal for the establishment of an international raw materials reserve to cover petroleum, iron ore, tin, rubber, and other raw materials, as well as food and fiber, is not new. An international food reserve resolution was introduced in 1953 by Senator Murray and 23 other Senators and by Congressman Metcalf.

A world food board idea was proposed immediately after World War II by Lord John Boyd Orr, first Director General of Food and Agriculture Organization.

An international commodity clearance house was proposed by Committee of Experts of FAO and IFAP, but was never ratified by the governments.

In 1954, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, made the following policy declaration (the eighth in as many years):

"inter-governmentally agreed rules be adopted by the countries concerned regarding principles to be followed in the disposal of surplus stocks in the world markets so that they interfere as little as possible with normal

production and trade, and that effective intergovernmental machinery be established for consultative purposes.

"the matter of a world food reserve should be kept under active consideration and to that end, the Committee recommends that the Secretariat prepare a study indicating the nature of the machinery needed to implement the plan and the obstacles that have stood in the way of attainment of this objective and giving all possible suggestions as to how such obstacles might be overcome."

The international food and raw materials reserve should be buttressed and coupled with additional international commodity agreements similar to the International Wheat Agreement.

At its 1954 meeting, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers said in its policy statement:

"IFAP reaffirms its faith in intergovernmental commodity agreements as a means of bringing about greater stability in the prices of major commodities moving in world commerce and will assist in creating a better public understanding of the underlying philosophy of such agreements as an important means of stabilizing trade."

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes, sir.

I will say first of all that we are glad to have the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture before us this evening.

I would like to explore very briefly with him two points in his presentation. The first one deals with this universal membership.

OBLIGATIONS OF U. N. MEMBERS

Mr. Brannan, have you and your organization given consideration as to whether or not a nation becoming a member of the United Nations should be expected to abide by the terms of the charter?

Mr. BRANNAN. Obviously no nation should be admitted on any terms other than that it assumed its proportionate responsibilities with all of the rest of the nations that are a part of the organization. There can be no benefit from this or any other organization without the assumption of the corresponding duties.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think that point is very well taken. I think that you have carried it one step further, which I think is important, and that is that they not only must not violate the terms of the charter but also assume their proportionate share of the obligations under the charter.

You are familiar, of course, with the fact at the time of the first overt act of aggression in Korea, we had 60 members of the United Nations. Outside of the United States of America only 16 of them made any contribution to the resistance of aggression in Korea. All 16 of them, put together, contributed 45,000 men and the United States of America alone contributed 450,000 in Armed Forces. We rotated 1 million men through Korea, which meant that we supplied 90 per cent of the manpower.

I take it in the light of your statement that you would not consider that to be a fair apportionment of the burden of enforcement.

Mr. BRANNAN. I think it was unfortunate that many of the countries who are members of the United Nations did not participate more in the Korea operation. Nevertheless, I think, Senator, that there has been much encouragement in the fact that from time to time some of the nations did come around, somewhat late, to the recognition of their responsibility, and did send some help. All of them did not. Perhaps all of them or many of them could not, because of their very

small size, their very small capital potentialities, and for a number of other reasons.

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, only 16 out of 60 did. That is the fact of the situation.

Mr. BRANNAN. Yes. But as a matter of fact, Senator, only a very few of the 60 were really capable in resources and manpower to make a very substantial contribution.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, in your paragraph 7 is an interesting suggestion. It is the first time it has been presented to the committee, at least to my knowledge. You mentioned:

The Security Council should be reconstituted as a Peace Enforcement Council with power assigned by the General Assembly to carry out disarmament decisions and to recruit, train, and command the United Nations inspection and police force so that violations of disarmament and other decisions can be promptly detected and stopped.

PROPRIETY OF INDIA ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Leaving that where it is at the moment, the point that I now raise is in section 9, which says:

India should be added as a permanent member of the recommended Peace Enforcement Council.

You are familiar with the fact that during the entire Korean war, India supplied no military force of any type or character, land, sea, or air, and only supplied an ambulance unit to resist aggression in Korea; are you not?

Mr. BRANNAN. Yes; I am, Senator.

Senator KNOWLAND. You know that Mr. Nehru in his speech before the Indian Parliament just this past week stated that no matter if the entire world was involved in a struggle, which could only mean that the free world, including all of the members of the United Nations, was fighting with its back to the wall, that nevertheless India would be neutral. Do you think under those circumstances that they would have any proper place on a Peace Enforcement Council, if they were not prepared to assume what you have testified a member of the United Nations should assume as an obligation?

Mr. BRANNAN. Well, Senator, first of all, I think we must recognize on the part of India, just as we recognize on the part of numerous spokesmen for the United States, that very often they do not express the will of all of the people of their country.

Senator KNOWLAND. No. But this was the Prime Minister of India.

Mr. BRANNAN. I recognize that, and I have noted wide disagreement between the President and some of the spokesmen for his own party in this country, and they are both recognized spokesmen, Senator, and I do not mean that in jest, nor in any other sense than that two people, truly representative in their capacities, have spoken.

That, of course, is only part of it. I have——

Senator KNOWLAND. I might say that neither one has spoken on the basis that we should not live up to our commitments in collective security.

Mr. BRANNAN. Well, golly, there have been so many things said, I will just have to accept that.

But I do want to make this point, Senator, that India, in the opinion of many of us, has evidenced an earnest will toward peace. It has attempted to act as negotiator, whether rightfully or wrongfully or well-advised or not. It is a nation composed of a tremendous number of people, 2 or 3 times that of the population of the United States. Their alinement on the side of the free peoples of the world is something to be desired very much, and I would think that it would be helpful to the causes of the free peoples of the world if they made some of the gestures to those forces in human manpower which may eventually play the deciding role in the ultimate determination of a peaceful world.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Brannan, I do not want to argue the point, I did not raise it for that purpose. You yourself suggested that the Security Council be reconstituted as a Peace Enforcement Council. Then you suggested under paragraph 9 that India should be added as a permanent member. But I understood your prior testimony to be that you felt that every member should assume its share of the responsibilities under the charter, unless I was mistaken.

Mr. BRANNAN. That is right.

EFFECT OF INDIA'S NEUTRALITY ON ITS U. N. OBLIGATIONS

Senator KNOWLAND. The fact of the matter is that in the first overt act of aggression which took place in Korea on the 25th day of June of 1950, and for the entire 3 years of the Korean war, India did not furnish under the charter, even though called upon by resolution of the Security Council, a single soldier, sailor, or airman to collective action in Korea. On top of it, just last week, the Prime Minister of India—not someone in the Parliament, not someone in the opposition party, not someone not holding the highest position in the Government, but the Prime Minister himself—said that even if the entire world was involved in war, nevertheless India itself would remain outside and keep neutral.

In view of those two facts, would India have a proper place on an enforcement council, where, according to you, it might have to take some very major action to enforce the decisions of the Council.

Mr. BRANNAN. Well, Senator, again I can only say to you that not alone in the matter of arms is the ultimate achievement of peace. The will to peace is an important factor, and they have evidenced some substantial will to peace, and they are an important nation on the face of the earth.

Senator KNOWLAND. I do not deny that.

Mr. BRANNAN. They stand between the Soviet Union and most of Africa and all of Southeast Asia, and the direction in which they move may well determine the balance of the world's manpower if and when there should be—and we hope there never will be—a showdown between the forces of evil and the forces of the free world—or the forces of good.

Senator KNOWLAND. I fully agree with you that this matter of resisting aggression involves more than military force alone, and I certainly do not in the slightest question the right of India to make any decision as a sovereign nation that it desires to make. My only point is whether it is entitled to sit as a member of an enforcement

agency if it is not prepared to accept the responsibilities that other nations would have to accept.

Now, you can afford the luxury of neutrality if somebody else is furnishing the police force to keep law and order in a community.

It may be naive, as some people believe, for Mr. Nehru to think that if all of Asia and all the world, including the United States, should fall to communism, that at that point communism would recognize the neutrality of India. I doubt it very much, and I do not think that a mere ambulance unit would stop communism under those circumstances.

Mr. BRANNAN. I agree with that, Senator. I do make the point, however, that just as the leading spokesman for this Nation changes from time to time, we might find another spokesman for India.

Senator KNOWLAND. That may be.

Mr. BRANNAN. It is the inherent reservoir of people that I am looking at rather than a recent remark of any one of its leaders.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Brannan. We are very glad to have had you.

The next witness is Mrs. Waller C. Brinker.

Mr. GOOD. After Mrs. Brinker, the next witness will be Mr. Wayne Williams.

Senator SPARKMAN. Will you come around, please. We are glad to have you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WALLER C. BRINKER, REPRESENTING MRS. ARTHUR L. ALLEN, PRESIDENT, COLORADO STATE SOCIETY, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. BRINKER. Senator, my name is Mrs. Waller C. Brinker, of Denver, Colo., State resolutions chairman, also representing Mrs. Arthur L. Allen, Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. This society is composed of approximately 2,500 members living throughout the State of Colorado. There are 36 chapters. The work of the organization is historical, educational, and patriotic.

Through the years these chapters meet locally, but once a year they hold a State conference. To this conference are brought questions concerning the welfare of our country, and these are considered with the idea of drawing up formal opinions on matters of particular importance in the form of resolutions.

This past February 1955, the conference passed 15 such resolutions. While not passed with your hearings in mind, several are pertinent to the subject matter under discussion, without much additional comment.

It is our understanding that it is the opinions of grassroot Americans that you are seeking. These resolutions are presented as such opinions.

DAR RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Included in my prepared statement for the convenience in using the printed page were 4 resolutions of which I only intended to read 2. However, instead of omitting No. 1, I will read it, because it is dia-

metrically opposed to the ideas of disarmament advanced here this afternoon. This is entitled "National Security." [Reading:]

Whereas the dangers of unpreparedness, and the vital need of maintaining a trained and well equipped Army, Navy, Air Force, and civil defense, have been proved by past experience;

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, urge upon the President and the Congress of the United States that the ground, air, sea force, and the civil defense be kept adequate for our own national security so that we, as a Nation, will be strong enough to offer firm protection for our country and resistance to any aggressor nation.

We believe in peace. We want peace. But we do not believe in peace at any price.

DAR RESOLUTION ON WORLD GOVERNMENT

The resolution on world government [reading]:

Whereas international cooperation is imperative if there is to be lasting peace among all peoples of the earth;

Whereas the United Nations Charter was adopted with the understanding that members would retain their national sovereignty and rights as free and independent nations;

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations comes up for revision in 1955 and many proponents of world government are working to have the charter changed to provide for a world government;

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, again declare itself in favor of the United Nations as an association of free nations;

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, reaffirm its opposition to any movement toward world government and urge every member to be informed and alert to oppose all such movements.

DAR RESOLUTION ON TREATY MAKING

Resolution on treaty making [reading]:

Whereas treaties, when negotiated by the President and ratified by the Senate, become the supreme law of the land, notwithstanding any State constitution or laws to the contrary;

Whereas only by proper restriction of the treaty-making power through constitutional amendment can we be sure that the rights of the States and the people will be safeguarded and preserved against any commitment to a foreign power violating these rights;

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, heartily endorse the principles of the Bricker amendment, and urge the passage of this amendment by the 84th Congress

STRENGTHENING OF DOMESTIC JURISDICTION CLAUSE OF CHARTER

These resolutions reflect the unanimous opinion of the Colorado Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. While presenting these resolutions, we wish to emphasize that article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter provides in part:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

Because we have not received the protection that this article was intended to provide, and further because of the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution, we believe that this article should be amended

to make it clear that the United Nations and its specialized agencies have no authority to draft international agreements dealing with subjects that are primarily the concern and responsibility of United Nations member nations and their political subdivisions.

These ideas are in keeping with those expressed by the eminent jurist, Judge Florence Allen, in her commentary entitled "The Treaty as an Instrument for Legislation."

In this work she states on page 26 that it was never contemplated by the founders of the Republic that the supremacy clause should place citizens of the United States in the position of having domestic law made for them by treaty.

This points up further the absolute necessity for the adoption of the Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution in order to erect a constitutional and congressional fence between the ambitions of the global bureaucrats and the inalienable rights of American citizens.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions, Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Brinker.
(The resolutions referred to follow:)

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 52D COLORADO STATE CONFERENCE OF THE COLORADO STATE SOCIETY OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., FEBRUARY 17, 18, 19, 1955

I. NATIONAL SECURITY

Whereas the dangers of unpreparedness, and the vital need of maintaining a trained and well-equipped Army, Navy, Air Force, and civil defense have been proved by past experience:

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, urge upon the President and the Congress of the United States that the ground, air, sea force, and the civil defense be kept adequate for our own national security so that we, as a Nation, will be strong enough to offer firm protection for our country and resistance to any aggressor nation.

(Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Senators.)

II. TREATY MAKING

Whereas treaties, when negotiated by the President and ratified by the Senate, become the supreme law of the land, notwithstanding any State constitution or laws to the contrary:

Whereas only by proper restriction of the treaty-making power through constitutional amendment can we be sure that the rights of the States and the people will be safeguarded and preserved against any commitment to a foreign power violating these rights:

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, heartily endorse the principles of the Bricker amendment, and urge the passage of this amendment by the 84th Congress.

(Copies of this resolution shall be sent to Senator Millikin, Senator Allott, Senator Bricker, to the Colorado Members of the House of Representatives, and to our national office in Washington, D. C.)

III. THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION OR TREATY

Whereas the Genocide Convention or Treaty, among other articles, stipulates that causing bodily or mental harm to members of a group is committing genocide, which would be a crime under international law, and would allow citizens of the United States to be sent outside the United States for trial without

recourse to the protection of the Constitution or right of appeal to any American court:

Resolved, That the Colorado State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, oppose the ratification of the Genocide Convention by the Senate of the United States.

(Copies of this resolution shall be sent to our Colorado Senators.)

IV. WORLD GOVERNMENT

Whereas international cooperation is imperative if there is to be lasting peace among all peoples of the earth:

Whereas the United Nations Charter was adopted with the understanding that members would retain their national sovereignty and rights as free and independent nations:

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations comes up for revision in 1955 and many proponents of world government are working to have the charter changed to provide for a world government:

Resolved. That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, again declare itself in favor of the United Nations as an association of free nations;

Resolved. That the Colorado State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, reaffirm its opposition to any movement toward world government and urge every member to be informed and alert to oppose all such movements.

Mr. Wayne Williams.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Williams, the next witness will be Mrs. Robert M. Dixon.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senators, and friends.

STATEMENT OF WAYNE D. WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN, DENVER CHAPTER, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My name is Wayne D. Williams. I am a lawyer. I appear here as an individual and also on behalf of the United World Federalists. This is an organization working for the strengthening of the U. N. into a world federation to achieve universal disarmament under proper safeguards applicable to nations and individuals.

We find ourselves today in a strange situation: A world sick of war frantically is preparing for war, with the new and terrible weapons which are so threatening and ominous we fear to use them, and yet they are so powerful we fear we shall have to use them.

Many sense today the impelling necessity to change the scene and bring on a new play, to grasp the forces which seem to be throwing us into war and somehow turn them in a new direction.

War, preventive or otherwise, is not the answer. Neither should we rest upon the naive hope that some revolutionary upheaval in the Soviet Union will transform our situation. Likely as not, the result of such an upheaval would be to place in power there a reckless, power-mad fanatic like Hitler, and maybe that already has occurred.

Nor should we achieve peace or can we achieve peace and order by weakening ourselves until some instrument shall have been fashioned which promises genuine security against war. We may, however, change the scene from war to peace by releasing the deep yearnings for peace felt by millions of people the world over and by offering an opportunity to express these yearnings in concrete structures of government.

This very opportunity presents itself in the likelihood that a conference to review the U. N. Charter will be held next year.

I strongly support the calling of such a conference.

I want to speak particularly of what might result from such a conference in terms of erecting a structure for real peace under law.

NEW POWERS FOR THE U. N.

I advocate giving the U. N. the following powers: First, to legislate upon and enforce disarmament; second, to define and prohibit crimes of aggression or preparation for aggression; and third, to support its authority in these limited fields through its own inspection and police forces and its own courts operating subject to a bill of rights.

The central defect in the charter as it stands is that it attempts to separate power from authority. It purports to give the U. N. broad authority in matters of war prevention. The 1950 resolutions of the General Assembly go even further than the charter in this respect. But in the U. N., as now constituted, all power is left to national control. The result is a house divided against itself.

The same defect appears in the long negotiations we have had for disarmament. I know the Russians are rascals, and they are perverse and they refuse to agree to anything in these talks. But let us realize, too, that a substantial cause of the failure thus far of these disarmament negotiations has been that they have proceeded upon the theory that the goal is merely to cut back or reduce national power, not to transfer that power to an international organization like the U. N.

Power, like nature, abhors a vacuum, and in my judgment we are utterly wasting our breath to talk disarmament unless we talk in terms of a genuine transfer of actual power to the U. N.

A mere treaty can never bring about the necessary vesting of powers in the U. N., and we should not attempt, in my opinion, to employ our own treaty power for this purpose.

I, for one, would welcome the prolonged and searching debate and consideration of an amendment to our Constitution proposing the placing of such powers in the U. N. Right ideas have a way of winning out. Through controversy and discussion they receive support which eventually proves irresistible.

If a review conference came out with a proposal for vesting genuine power in the U. N., we would witness a worldwide debate on a level which has not made its appearance in human affairs since the debate on ratification of our own Constitution, and this debate would even be felt within the Soviet Union. The Russian masters could not keep it out.

I am more concerned, as you see, about the fact of national survival than I am about the theory of national sovereignty so long as freedom is properly safeguarded.

The plain truth is, we lost a great deal of sovereignty when we became a world power. We have been forced to fight two great wars for our survival in a single generation against our own desires. We lost sovereignty, too, when we exploded the first atomic bomb. The development and testing of such weapons has been necessary in the present situation of world energy, but the fact remains that weapons which

can destroy humanity must belong to humanity and be under its control.

The scientists, if I can be facetious, have really put it up to the Senator, and, more seriously, have put it up to the American people. Their fantastic new weapons challenge us to respond with imaginative world-encompassing statesmanship.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

U. N. BILL OF RIGHTS

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Williams, do you really believe that the Soviet Union would approve a charter revision that would, in fact, incorporate substantially the American Bill of Rights in a charter provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. When the Bill of Rights is directed at protecting nations and individuals against an excessive exercise of power by the U. N. itself.

Senator KNOWLAND. And you believe the men in the Kremlin would agree to that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course. They don't want the U. N. to exercise inordinate power any more than we do. I am not, of course, talking about having a U. N. bill of rights, which will try to enforce what a nation does to its own citizens. That is a matter, as has been pointed out, of domestic jurisdiction.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Williams is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF WAYNE D. WILLIAMS

My name is Wayne D. Williams. I am a lawyer and have done some special work from time to time in the field of international law.

I am appearing here as an individual, and also as chairman of the local chapter of United World Federalists, Inc., and a member of the national executive council of that organization. United World Federalists, Inc., is a nonprofit corporation, with offices in New York City and branches and chapters in many States, formed to work for the establishment of the United Nations as a world federation to achieve universal disarmament under proper safeguards applicable to all nations and individuals.

Our present situation is nothing less than tragic. A war-sick world frantically prepares for war. New and terrible weapons are brought forth, so threatening and ominous we fear to use them, but so powerful we fear not to use them.

All sense the impelling necessity to change the scene and bring on a new play, to grasp the forces which seem to be throwing us into war, and somehow turn them in a new direction.

Here is a world poised for war and annihilation. Yonder are the Elysian fields of peace and plenty. How do we get from here to there?

We shall not get there by war. There will be no victor in the next war, and chaos, not order, will be its aftermath. It is naive to hope that some revolutionary upheaval in the Soviet Union will get us there. The more likely result of any such upheaval would be to place in power a reckless, power-mad fanatic like Hitler, if in truth that has not already occurred. Nor shall we achieve peace and order by weakening ourselves, until some instrument shall have been fashioned which offers genuine security from war.

We may, however, change the scene from war to peace by releasing the deep yearnings for peace felt by people the world over, and by offering an opportunity to express these yearnings in concrete structures of government.

This very opportunity now presents itself in the likelihood that a conference to review the Charter of the United Nations may be called this fall and convene

early next year. Our Government and all free governments should energetically support the calling of such a conference.

A review conference poses no threat either to the United States or to the United Nations. Under the charter, new obligations are not binding upon us unless we accept them through our own constitutional processes.

We should, of course, take no risk of jeopardizing the immense good in the United Nations as it is. But review is a healthy and life-building process in politics. A conference called to review the means and methods of keeping peace offers nothing but promise and value to a United Nations whose very life depends upon peace.

When the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, made his report to the President upon the San Francisco Conference, he stated:

"The Charter of the United Nations is the product of concerted action. Its purpose is the maintenance of peace. It offers means for the achievement of that purpose. If the means are inadequate to the task they must perform, time will reveal their inadequacy as time will provide, also, the opportunity to amend them."

Time and sober reflection both have served to reveal the inadequacy of the system of so-called collective security upon which the peace-keeping authority of the United Nations was founded.

Consider the provisions of the charter which were supposed to make the United Nations a powerful instrument of security against war. The military Staff Committee established by article 47 might as well never have been formed. It has never had any forces to command. No country has ever made available to the Security Council any armed forces at all, as provided in article 43, or any air-force contingents, as provided in article 45.

All of these arrangements have proved to be wholly illusory. The defect has not been, merely, that such supposed powers were vested in a veto-ridden Security Council. After the adoption of the uniting-for-peace resolutions in 1950, which moved the center of gravity in security matters over into the veto-free General Assembly, there was no material change in the situation. The resolutions provided for a Peace Observation Commission, and for special training and equipment of contingents of national armed forces to be held in readiness for service as U. N. forces. Only a few governments have ever made any such assignment of forces, and we have yet to see any signs of life in the Peace Observation Commission set up by those resolutions.

The world has had too much of such high-sounding phrases and puny performance. The fact is that in the United Nations old-fashioned diplomacy and power politics may be wearing new clothes, but they are the same old delusions underneath.

Nothing short of a bold and imaginative new approach offers any hope of materially diminishing the present threat of annihilation.

From the beginning of the U. N. to this day, the central difficulty has been that individually powerful nations have not made the transfer of actual power to the U. N. which such an objective clearly requires.

Power and authority cannot thus be separated one from the other, and so long as military power is organized nationally, individual nations will continue to determine for themselves the occasion for its use paying more regard to self-interest than to commitments.

In discussing the changes in the charter which should be made, if the conference is to have real significance on the question of war or peace, I propose to offer principles rather than details. A number of the witnesses who are to be heard today will discuss, I am sure, specific details of necessary amendments to the charter in keeping with these principles.

The need is for genuine power and authority in the United Nations in the field of peacekeeping, exercised and applied to individuals and governments through representative processes, with a Bill of Rights assuring due regard for domestic jurisdiction and personal freedom. Power, justice, and freedom still remain trustworthy standards to which the wise and honest may repair.

To give the United Nations such authority certainly would require that it be given power to enforce disarmament, power to define and prohibit crimes of aggression or preparation for aggression and power to support its authority in these limited fields through its own inspection and police forces and its own courts; and to accomplish these ends by law, through representative processes, not by the decree of a tyrant.

All of these matters have been made the subject of various treaties or proposals for treaties in recent years, but without tangible results.

I have already mentioned the ineffectual provisions in the charter, and in General Assembly resolutions, for assigning national military forces to the U. N.

As for disarmament, the long and exasperating negotiations have not served to allay fear, and have not brought about the destruction of a single bomber or tank. The cause of this impasse is not Russian perversity alone, real as that is. A substantial cause is that the discussions have proceeded upon the theory that what is sought is merely to cut back or reduce national power, not to transfer that power to an international organization such as the U. N. True, the current proposals involve features of inspection, but what will inspection tell us, really, that we do not already know? Disarmament will never, in my judgment, be brought about except as it is based upon a genuine transfer of actual power to the U. N. or to somebody like the U. N. Power, like nature, abhors a vacuum.

As for prohibiting international crimes, and establishing an international criminal court, very valuable preparatory work has already been done by the International Law Commission, established by the General Assembly. While the proposals of the Commission are in treaty form, and thus are subject to the objection just made, they could easily be rewritten in the form of law. As a point aside, let me call attention to the fact that the latest proposal of the Commission for an international criminal court embodies every measure for a fair trial and for protection of the rights of the accused that our own Constitution affords.

The basic point to be stressed is that mere treaties can never bring about the necessary vesting of powers in the United Nations, and we should not attempt to employ our own treaty power for this purpose. If such powers as I have mentioned are to be conferred upon the United Nations, amendment of the United States Constitution is absolutely necessary. This could and should come only after the prolonged and searching debate and consideration which such an amendment would require. I want to make very clear that this is also the position taken by the United World Federalists. In the official organ, *The Federalist*, for April 1953, the following statement was published to all members of the organization:

"The purpose of our organization is to work for the establishment of a world federation with adequate though limited powers to prevent aggression and maintain world peace. If the United States is to enter such a federation, the Constitution of the United States must be amended. The United States should not be committed to enter such a federation by treaty or by executive agreement."

What I am advocating is not a world superstate of general powers to invade and control our private lives and local affairs. It is a federation having carefully prescribed powers adequate, nevertheless, in the field of preventing war and aggression.

If a form of limited world government is necessary to establish peace on a more secure basis, and I believe it is, then let us stop kidding ourselves that anything less will suffice. Prime Minister Churchill declared a few years ago that:

"Unless some effective world supergovernment for the purposes of preventing war can be set up and begin its reign, the prospects for peace and human progress are dark and doubtful."

This declaration from a statesman of incomparable experience and judgment, whom none would characterize as a visionary or a dreamer, cannot be shrugged away.

I am more concerned about the fact of national survival than I am concerned about the theory of national sovereignty, so long as freedom is properly safeguarded. The plain fact is that we lost a great deal of national sovereignty when we became a world power. As a world power we have been forced to fight two great wars for survival in a single generation against our own desires. We lost more of our sovereignty, a large measure of it, when we developed and exploded the first atomic bomb and when we proceeded with the development of more and more powerful bombs. The development and testing of such weapons has been necessary. We could not safely do otherwise in the present situation of world anarchy. Nevertheless the fact is that weapons now exist which are far too dangerous to be entrusted to the safekeeping of any single nation.

Right ideas have a way of winning out. Through discussion, controversy, and debate, they receive support which eventually proves irresistible. Here is all the more reason why a review conference should be held without delay. Any proposal for vesting genuine power in the U. N. would launch a worldwide debate on a level which has not made its appearance in human affairs since the debate

upon the ratification of our own Constitution. It is this kind of searching inquiry into and controversy over the merits of proposals to constitute the United Nations with powers of government that, in my judgment, offers by far the best and perhaps the only hope that can be found in our situation today to halt the arms race and grapple realistically with the problem of preventing war.

If these ideas seem fantastic, let us remember that this has become a fantastic world. We have demanded fantastic achievements of the scientists, and they have produced unbelievable weapons of annihilation. Now we must demand a protection from those weapons which separate nations no longer can provide. The great need of this hour is for imaginative statesmanship to match fantastic weapons. If statesmanship can rise to this challenge, and I believe it can, humanity is on the threshold of a new age of abundance and plenty which cannot be described.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Robert M. Dixon.

Mr. GOOD. After Mrs. Dixon, the next witness will be Mr. David Toll.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Mrs. Dixon.

Mrs. DIXON. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT M. DIXON, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLORADO

Mrs. DIXON. I am Mrs. Robert M. Dixon, president of the League of Women Voters of Colorado, and for the League of Women Voters I wish to thank the Senate committee for the conduct of these hearings which are making it easy for Americans to express themselves directly to the Congress. Since ours is an organization encouraging citizen participation in Government you may conclude we regard the hearings very favorably and are pleased to be able to participate.

I am judging that the committee is interested in recording the opinion of as many persons as time will permit. Therefore, it occurs to me it may be of value to the record to note that I can testify for the League of Women Voters only because all of our members throughout the United States have had the opportunity, through the democratic procedure we employ, to methodically analyze, consider, discuss, and come to a point of view on the matter of United States participation in the United Nations.

This opportunity has been repeated every year of the U. N.'s existence. On the record is a strong majority opinion supporting the United Nations. Only because that is true may I make a statement in the name of the League of Women Voters. Thus the opinion I reflect is that of thousands of informed citizens in more than 900 communities throughout the Nation.

ENDORSEMENT OF THE U. N.

Because the United Nations Charter embodies the principles of international cooperation for which the league has worked through its 33-year history, we support it. The basic assumption on which the United Nations was founded remains as true today as it was in 1945 when the league worked diligently to support Senate ratification of the charter. That assumption is that only through the cooperation of all nations, in a universal world organization, can the peace be kept. We regard the United Nations as the cornerstone of United States foreign policy today.

This position does not imply endorsement of every policy or every part of the U. N. program. It has not fulfilled all of our hopes for it but we think it a necessary mechanism for settling international differences. We know its impressive record of contribution to the solution of world social, economic, and political problems. We are striving in an ever-widening program to enlarge citizen understanding of the interdependence of the world and the need for working with other nations toward peaceful objectives.

Now, our members are currently engaged in reviewing the charter. We have not approached the review with any foregoing assumption that the charter should be revised. We think 10 years a very brief history for an effort with the tremendous peace potential of the United Nations. Thus we believe that any changes in the charter should be limited to those clearly designed to strengthen the U. N.'s ability to fulfill its purposes as stated in the charter.

MORE EXTENSIVE USE OF THE U. N.

The league would strongly oppose any charter changes that would weaken the functions of the U. N. in the promotion of international cooperation. Any proposal that would destroy the universal character of the United Nations, thus closing the approach to peaceable solutions, the league would reject.

We urge upon our Government the recognition that in its role of world leadership it has a special responsibility to strengthen the United Nations, by our increased participation in it, for we are convinced that success in any U. N. endeavor is not dependent so much on organization and procedure as it is upon the willingness of member nations to make use of it. The league supports more extensive use of the existent agencies and adequate financial contributions. We emphasize the importance of using the United Nations as much as possible to administer economic development programs.

As of this date the League of Women Voters has no position on the specifics of charter revision. We are eagerly awaiting studies on the subject, now in preparation by the United Nations, Carnegie Endowment, the Department of State, and Brookings Institute, and especially the findings of the Senate committee. Meanwhile this record will show that the League of Women Voters considers the United Nations a necessity to our domestic security—indeed to our very survival.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. Mrs. Dixon, of course you are quite correct that 10 years is a very short period of time in human history. Unfortunately, however, in the last 10 years, 600 million people have lost their freedom to international communism, and 50 million people, their lives. So a lot has happened in those 10 years.

Mrs. DIXON. Indeed it has.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Dixon.

Mrs. DIXON. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. David Toll.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Toll, the next witness will be Mr. Harry H. Hoiles.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Toll, we are glad to have you, representing the junior chamber of commerce.

Mr. TOLL. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF DAVID R. TOLL, CHAIRMAN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE, DENVER JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, distinguished Senators, my name is David Toll, and I am a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., and of the Yale Law School, a lawyer, and the chairman of the international relations committee of the Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce. Our organization is greatly honored and pleased to have this opportunity to express our views before your distinguished committee, and we are very pleased that your committee has come to Denver.

I speak today on behalf of the international relations committee of the Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce. Our committee is composed of about 10 men between the ages of 25 and 35, from various professions. Most of the members of our committee are veterans who have traveled to foreign countries, and we feel that it is imperative that we keep informed of, and concerned about, the many problems in international relations. We meet regularly with foreign students or foreign visitors to our city, and we offer them the hospitality of our homes, where we have held joint discussions with them concerning problems of mutual interest.

Concerning the problem of U. N. Charter amendment, our committee has given long and careful study to this problem. We have had several meetings to discuss the problem, and we have formulated this statement, which has been approved by the board of directors of the Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The junior chamber of commerce has a creed which states, among other things, that we believe "that the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations," and that we believe that "government should be of laws rather than of man." We believe that these principles of our creed are reflected in the following proposals, which we submit to your committee as recommendations for amendment to the U. N. Charter:

1. The United States should favor a U. N. Charter Review Conference

We recommend that the United States actively support the calling of an international conference to review and possibly revise the U. N. Charter. We believe that the U. N. is not the effective organization that it should be, and that much could be accomplished through charter review. Even if the charter should not be amended at all, we believe that such a conference would be useful in reviewing the accomplishments, and the shortcomings, of the U. N. over the last 10-year period.

2. The U. N. should be strengthened

We believe that the U. N. should be strengthened, not weakened. The U. N. has been a disappointment in many ways, but its record of accomplishment holds promise for the future, in our opinion. At the

present time we believe that it provides our best means in settling international disputes across the conference table rather than on the battlefield.

3. More universal membership

We believe that membership in the United Nations should be on a more universal basis. In order that this may be a truly international forum, we believe that even if some countries do not agree with us in all respects, they should nonetheless be represented.

Although we believe that universal membership should be the eventual goal, this does not necessarily mean that Red China should be admitted as a member of the United Nations at the present time.

In line with the goal of universal membership, we believe that the veto power should not extend to, or be applicable to, the admission of new members to the U. N. However, we believe that the charter should continue to provide, as it does now, that membership should be open only to "peace-loving states."

Suggest a trial membership approach: On the question of admission of new members, we have a recommendation that has not been proposed before, to our knowledge. We can see no reason why new members to the U. N. should not be admitted on a provisional basis. Thus, a potential new member would be invited on a trial membership basis for a determined period of years—for example, 1, 2, or 3 years—and, if it demonstrated that it was qualified for permanent membership by demonstrating that it is a "peace-loving state," it could then be so accepted, by majority—or perhaps three-fourths—vote of the General Assembly, as a permanent member at the end of the trial period. We believe that this system might encourage potential new members who do not currently demonstrate characteristics of "peace-loving states" to mend their ways, in order to be admitted to the international forum.

4. Disarmament

We believe that the charter should be amended to take a more forceful and definite position in favor of world disarmament—especially atomic disarmament. The eventual goal should be an international inspection and police force with full power and authority to inspect and limit armaments in all countries of the world. Unless the continuing armament race is stopped, our chances for world peace can never be very bright.

We recognize, however, that it would be folly to stop or decelerate our own armament program until such time as the Soviet Union agrees to the principles of international patrol and inspection of armaments. Nevertheless, we believe that we should keep working toward the desired goal, under the authority of the United Nations. Therefore, we recommend that the charter be amended to establish and create a new U. N. agency to work constantly and exclusively toward the goal of an international disarmament agreement.

5. The veto power

In order that the purposes of the United Nations may be more effectively carried out, we believe that the veto power of the five permanent members of the Security Council should be severally limited. The abuse of the veto power during the past 10 years has crippled the effectiveness of the United Nations. We do not believe

that the veto power should be abolished, but we think that it would be valuable if this committee should study those areas in which it might be limited. Perhaps the charter could be amended to provide that the veto should not apply to questions involved in the admission of new members, disarmament, and the peaceful settling of international disputes.

Another suggestion might be that unanimous action by all 5 permanent members of the Security Council should not be required, but that action by any 3 of such 5 members should be required. In this way we believe that the United States and its allies of the free world could effectively obtain their goals and yet retain sufficient voice to override unacceptable proposals of the Soviet Union.

6. International police force

We believe that the U. N. Charter should be amended to provide the U. N. with a standing police force. The history of our own country in its early days indicates that a government without any means of enforcement tends to be no government at all.

We believe that all nations should contribute to the support of such a police force.

7. International Court of Justice

We believe that the power and authority of the International Court of Justice should be greatly increased. We believe that the charter should be amended to provide that the International Court should have compulsory jurisdictional over all disputes between member nations.

Under our own system of law and order in the United States, if one party feels he is injured, he may force the other party to come into court, in order that the matter may be given a full hearing. This is not now the case in international law, when both member nations must voluntarily agree to submit the matter to the Court or else it may not be heard.

We believe that the charter should be amended so that all such disputes between member nations might be brought into Court even though one of the countries concerned might not desire a public hearing. Eventually, all opinions of the Court should be compulsory, although, at this time, it is perhaps possible only to provide that the Court's opinions should be of an advisory nature only.

Law should become the accepted standard for international conduct. The late Senator Robert Taft once said that—

in the long run the only way to establish peace is to write a law, agreed to by each of the nations, to govern the relations of such nations with each other and to obtain the covenant of all such nations that they will abide by that law and by decisions made thereunder.

We believe that Senator Taft's belief is in line with our own junior chamber of commerce creed that "Government should be of laws, rather than of men."

8. Specialized agencies

We believe that the U. N., although it has not attained its primary goal of world peace, has accomplished much along other lines. It has, through its specialized agencies, contributed much toward the cultural, social, and economic improvement of many persons in many parts of the world. We believe that the work of the U. N. in the fields of

health, greater food production, aid to children, and technical assistance, should be continued and greatly increased.

Finally, we believe that your committee is doing a real service to our country by studying these questions. We thank you for this opportunity to state our views.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think on the membership vetoes, the record, if I am not mistaken, shows that 28 vetoes were invoked by the U. S. S. R.

Mr. TOLL. Yes, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Membership vetoes?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; membership vetoes.

Mr. TOLL. We believe the question of membership should not be within the control of one nation. That is the blackball system. We believe it is a more democratic process that the membership, itself, as a whole, the General Assembly, should determine its own membership, and therefore we would recommend that the veto power be limited so as not to apply to the question of admission of new members; and if coupled with this trial membership arrangement, it might break the current deadlock.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hoiles.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Hoiles, the next witness will be Dr. Howard Higman.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, sir. Proceed as you see fit.

STATEMENT OF HARRY H. HOILES, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

Mr. HOILES. I am Harry Hoiles, publisher of the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph and vice president of Freedom Newspapers, which publishes 10 daily newspapers with a total circulation of 160,000.

The other day, in a Colorado Springs debate over the U. N., the pro-U. N. speaker made the claim that U. N. proponents believe in "negotiations rather than force."

I had wondered why anyone could still support the U. N. after the tragic history of the last 10 years' altercations in Korea, Indochina, off Formosa, et cetera, also, in view of present-day conditions in which war preparations are going on at great speed in spite of the U. N. claims of being a way to avoid war.

On hearing this phrase that U. N. proponents believe in "negotiations rather than force" I wondered if this catchy slogan was responsible for people still arguing for the U. N. in the face of its dismal record of failure.

It is a catchy slogan. But it isn't the truth.

U. N. BASED ON FORCE

U. N. supporters do not believe in negotiations rather than force. On the contrary, they believe in force rather than negotiations. The whole U. N. is based on force. On a form of war initiated by its supporters against peaceful citizens who favor the free market as a way of promoting peace.

Those who favor the U. N. not only commit aggressive force against us who peacefully advocate voluntary exchange as the way to pro-

mote peace, they even take our funds from us and use those very funds against us.

For instance: I am very much interested in using all the facilities I possess to promote understanding in the freedom newspapers and other publications of what I believe to be the truth.

Now, do the U. N. promoters come to me and negotiate? Do they use persuasion to convince me that I should support the U. N. and if I say, "No, thanks," do they accept my decision? No; they do not.

Instead of negotiating with those of us who have other ideas, these U. N. advocates worm their way into positions of government power so they can initiate government force against us to make us pay for ideas that are abhorrent to us.

Here are six booklets published by UNESCO. I would not voluntarily contribute one red cent to publishing this socialistic trash. But the U. N. force lovers take tax funds from me and make me pay for this kind of stuff. Thus, my effectiveness in exposing these publications for what they are is reduced. I seek the freedom to take the funds exacted from me by U. N. government force to pay for this junk and use these funds to explain why I consider these publications junk.

This is just a small example of how the advocates of force take funds from peaceful citizens and use those funds to oppose those of us from whom the funds are taken.

The U. N. promoters' actions speak louder than their words. Their actions prove they believe in using aggressive force against us who have ideas other than their own. And not only do they seize funds from those of us who peacefully disagree with them, they take our funds and use these very funds against us as per booklets like these. A double dose of aggressive force against peaceful citizens who ask nothing but freedom to use our own funds to promote our own ideas.

Is the U. N. a forum for ideas? It is no forum for the ideas of those like me who oppose it. It squelches our opposition while claiming to promote peace.

Is the U. N. a world government? What force other than government makes people like me pay for publications like these? As a victim of this force, let me assure you that it is force. And it is aggressive force. My choice, in the final analysis, is to either pay for these publications or resist the force used to collect payments from me and be shot.

The U. N. is now a world government terrorizing those of us who do not believe it can possibly work.

It is supported by force, and force begets force.

WITHDRAWAL URGED

Instead of placing trust in force, we should advocate peaceful voluntary relations between people. We should trust the free unhampered market where goods of all kinds, where books and publications, where ideas are exchanged on a voluntary basis. Where those who want publications like these pay for them. Where those who do not want them do not pay for them, but pay for other publications—for instance, these—they do want.

We who believe in a free market really believe in negotiations rather than force. But the U. N. advocates who disrupt the free

market and make us pay for publications and ideas we abhor, believe in force rather than negotiations.

I urge the United States withdrawal from the U. N. Let those who believe in a world organization set one up and pay for it themselves. Don't make those of us who have other ideas pay for and support ideas we abhor.

Senator KNOWLAND. Would you just for the record give the names of the publications, the UNESCO publications you held in your hand?

Mr. HOILES. Toward World Understanding, No. 1; In the Classroom With Children Under 13 Years of Age, Toward World Understanding, 5; The Education and Training of Teachers, Toward World Understanding, 2; The Influence of Home and Community, Toward World Understanding, 6; Suggestions on the Teachings of History, Toward World Understanding, 9; History Textbooks and International Understanding, Toward World Understanding, No. 11.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Hoiles.

Dr. Howard Higman.

Mr. GOOD. Following Dr. Higman, the next witness will be Mr. Robert LeFevre.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Dr. Higman.

STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD HIGMAN, BOULDER, COLO.

Dr. HIGMAN. My name is Howard Higman. I am the chairman of the department of sociology at the University of Colorado in Boulder. I am also the chairman of the Conference on World Affairs of the university. I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you with my opinions concerning the coming United Nations Charter Review Conference.

SPECIFIC CHANGES SUGGESTED

It is my opinion that the nature of modern communications and the possibilities of the development and use of weapons require the establishment of more nearly juridical world order to a limited degree under world law. Specifically, I believe that the United Nations should be strengthened by:

1. Universal compulsory membership.
2. The abolishment of the doctrine of the equality of nations, which means some change in the form of representation which would give the large nations weight in the General Assembly commensurate with their power.
3. The recognition of the legal status in world law of entities other than states, i. e., governments, associations, and persons.
4. Giving the United Nations a monopoly in the use of atomic violence.

FEASIBILITY OF CHARTER REVISION

Because I believe that these problems are well recognized and adequately debated, I should prefer to address myself to the question of the feasibility of the United States adopting a position advocating the strengthening of the United Nations at this time.

The argument is made that the Russians will not accept a stronger United Nations. I do not believe that it is our primary responsibility to ascertain what the Russians may or may not do, but rather, for both moral reasons and for reasons of expediency, it is to our interests to offer to accept changes in the United Nations deemed by us to make for world order under law.

First, we may defend our lack of leadership in this direction, by the statement that the Russians will not accept any changes. This argument is of weak and even negative propaganda value. Our proposals if we make them, even though they may be rejected by the Russians, stand in the incontrovertible light of leadership and morality before world public opinion.

Secondly, we must not perceive of the Soviet hierarchy as a monolithic and unified structure unalterably opposed to world order, but rather as a precariously balanced equilibrium inevitably destined to change during the necessary internal power struggles. An American position consonant with world opinion in the direction of world order under law places special strain on those factions of the Soviet hierarchy which in our own interest it is most necessary to weaken, and a correct American position offers leverage to those elements in the Soviet hierarchy offering the most possibility for peaceful coexistence.

Third, is the question of time. A correct position, fearlessly asserted, unambiguously explained and categorically upheld, even though rejected in a final vote or decision by the intransigence of the ignorant or evil, does not lose. Rather, by their weight, on their own merit, correct ideas, once exposed, cannot be stopped by parliamentary or institutional processes, but have a way of gaining in momentum and making themselves felt in the conduct of man's relationships with man—sooner rather than later, although often through instruments and structures which could not have been foreseen.

I am saying here that experience shows us that when power apparently wins a battle against that which is right the very procedure whereby that victory is won insures its own short life and the ultimate victory of the apparent loser. The correctness in a minority's defeated position comes always to govern the conduct of the victorious majority.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

COMPULSORY UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

Senator KNOWLAND. One question.

Professor Higman, I would like to explore your first point on universal compulsory membership. Supposing Nation A did not want to belong to the United Nations, how far would you take your compulsion requiring membership?

Dr. HIGMAN. My position is derived from the existence of hydrogen weapons, and I would hold that any nation big enough—however small—to make one hydrogen bomb is too big not to be in the U. N. and under its control—that far.

Senator KNOWLAND. Then you would go to the extent of making war upon them if they did not want to come in?

Dr. HIGMAN. Yes; certainly. That is not humorous at all.

Senator KNOWLAND. No. I do not think it is humorous, either. But I was just exploring it.

Dr. HIGMAN. I don't think enough of us are aware of the fact that one hydrogen bomb involves now an explosion of 22 million tons of TNT, and I don't think that when this sort of thing exists in the world we can allow the creation of that kind of weapon to be under the hands of nations free from world order.

Senator KNOWLAND. It is an interesting doctrine.

Dr. HIGMAN. I think it is one that will gain a great deal of strength.

Senator KNOWLAND. It certainly goes a long way when you use your world organization to compel membership.

Dr. HIGMAN. I should point out this has always been the history of all governments. Every government was formed in force by a majority that imposed order on a minority that threatened it.

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes.

Dr. HIGMAN. And I think the world is going to do that now.

Senator KNOWLAND. In your next point you are comparing the world government to the creation of our own Government. In our case we had a general common interest in free institutions, and in a world organization you do not have that same devotion to freedom.

Now you can have a world organization and you can have survivors, but you may be serving under a dictatorship with the loss of freedom. And whether the people of the free nations of the world would want to dilute their freedom, I think, is also a very real question.

Dr. HIGMAN. Yes.

LIMITED SUBORDINATION TO U. N. ADVOCATED

I want to point out that I am not advocating a single world government at all. I am advocating the strengthening of the rudimentary government we now have, the United Nations, just sufficiently to insure that each nation may regain the sovereignty it had before it was threatened by the possibility of atomic destruction.

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes. But that is a little easier said than done. I am not arguing with you. That is correct. But I just wanted to explore specifically with you this doctrine of compulsion and also how far you were prepared to go toward world government. You mentioned that each government that has been organized has the power to impose its laws and its will, which is quite true. In our own country, not to raise any argument with my friend from Alabama, we went through a great Civil War, or War Between the States, in order to have the Federal jurisdiction maintained over all the States of the Union, but we were tied together pretty closely in a Constitution, and despite our differences, both the South and the North believed in representative government and freedom, and so forth.

Dr. HIGMAN. What I would advocate is the placing of sovereignty in relation to world law, as far as the use of atomic violence is concerned, in precisely the same relationship that individual freedom is in our own country under law.

We do not feel, because we accept law, which is superior, rather than a coordinate, that we are not free men, and in like fashion, I think it is not necessary or possible that sovereign nations can give up their sovereignty and their national differences because they accept a limited subordination to the amount of world law necessary to

control hydrogen weapons, and the possibility of their destruction of all of us.

EFFECT OF CONTROL OVER HYDROGEN AND ATOM BOMB

Senator KNOWLAND. Do you think your problem is going to be solved by merely controlling hydrogen and atomic weapons?

Dr. HIGMAN. Well, I think that there will be conflict in the world necessarily. For example, I think that there will be an anti-Communist alliance, our own, and I think this conflict may well go on 100 years under the pretext of the—through the method of competition, of education, of commerce, of industry, rather much like the competition between Britain and the United States from 1812 to 1914. But I do not think that we will be able to allow the Soviet Union, for example, to have at its disposal 5 or 10 years hence hydrogen weapons, intercontinental rockets that they can direct against us, and destroy us at their whim.

I don't believe we can do that.

Senator KNOWLAND. But, Professor Higman, do you know that most of the responsible military and I think civilian people both at home and abroad recognize if atom and hydrogen bombs were completely ruled out of the picture, you almost inevitably give Communists control of Europe and perhaps the world, because in organized divisions, conventional types of weapons, and manpower both of Communist China and the Soviet Union, they are preponderant and they could very likely take over all of Europe and perhaps the balance of Asia as well, if there were no atomic weapons to stop them.

Dr. HIGMAN. Yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that merely limiting the atomic weapons is not going to solve the problem unless you are just as interested in limiting other types of military weapons.

Dr. HIGMAN. I am interested in limiting any weapons used beyond the maintenance of domestic order in the Nation, and my position is based upon the facts, or the opinions, or the statements of Brig. Gen. Thomas Phillips, the military correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, by whom I am informed that, present procedures progressing, the United States will be almost committed to totally atomic type of military establishment within 5 years, that the Chinese themselves, the Red Chinese, would be able to attack us, or Formosa, rather, in 2 years by atomic weapons, and I am more afraid of the Chinese than I am of the Soviet Union, for there are 600 million persons who have a long antipathy to the white.

I think it is time we get the rules written in such a way that before these people of Asia and Africa become totally mechanized and equipped with the weapons to destroy us, that these rules will control how those weapons will be used.

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes.

But, of course, you advocate, in your subdivision 4, putting in the hands of the United Nations control of all atomic weapons, which, ipso facto, gives the Soviet world the great predominance on military power, and would, if atomic weapons were abolished tonight, in fact give the Soviet world such a predominance of power that they could probably take over Europe and Asia.

Dr. HIGMAN. I understand, and I agree with you, sir.

My statement is not clear on this point, and I certainly agree with you.

Senator KNOWLAND. I was trying to clarify it a little.

Dr. HIGMAN. Yes, because I would say, "all weapons to make war," although if there had not developed atomic weapons, I am not certain that I feel that this is necessary. But I feel that you cannot just eliminate the atomic weapons. But I don't think that this would necessarily have been true in 1939.

PROPOSALS ARE FOR THE FUTURE

Senator SPARKMAN. You do not think that we have reached the point yet for this kind of plan, do you?

Dr. HIGMAN. What I am saying is, I am talking about what position the United States should adopt, and I think we should decide what the proper position is, and I think we should advocate it, and I don't think we should be concerned about the fact that it may not be feasible and it may not be accepted in the immediate future.

I think it may take quite some time before the process of advocacy will result in the change in persons' views adequately to institutionalize it.

I said, I don't know but what these things may come to be under the existing structure of the U. N. Our own Constitution actually has undergone quite a lot of change without being amended: the judicial review and the direct, if not popular, election of the President came about through men's changing view, without amendment.

That may happen in the U. N. But it will not if we don't talk about it and advocate it.

COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSED

Senator SPARKMAN. With reference to your compulsory membership, I was just thinking of Switzerland. Switzerland is right in the midst of the stronghold of the United Nations, and yet it has never been a member of the U. N.

Dr. HIGMAN. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. Do you think that Switzerland should be compelled to join?

Dr. HIGMAN. I think that if Switzerland could make one hydrogen bomb, that I think it improper——

Senator KNOWLAND. She can. Obviously they have the area to do it.

Dr. HIGMAN. Then they can, and I think that we could not live long in security without having the United Nations in a position to control and assure the manufacture of thermonuclear weapons and their use, and that would include Switzerland.

Senator SPARKMAN. I suppose the nearest we ever came to working up international agreements like your proposal with reference to the hydrogen bomb, was the control of poison gas, in which most of the nations of the world voluntarily agreed to abstain from the use of it.

We were one of the exceptions. Suppose your rule had pertained then; do you think we might have been compelled to sign that agreement?

Dr. HIGMAN. I don't think there is any analogy whatever between poison gas and hydrogen weapons.

Senator SPARKMAN. I admit it is rather farfetched. I started off by saying that it was about the nearest that we had had yet. Of course, we have not lived in the hydrogen-bomb era yet. We are just beginning to live in it.

Dr. HIGMAN. If the power of destruction of these weapons is not what I am told it is, then I would not hold these views.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland here is on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. I think he could tell you that it is all that you have been told, and perhaps more.

Dr. HIGMAN. I am scared.

Senator KNOWLAND. We will admit in evidence that it is a potent weapon.

Dr. HIGMAN. I think we ought to control it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Higman.

Dr. HIGMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. LeFevre, the next witness will be Mr. Howard Wallace.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you with us, sir.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT LEFEVRE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CONGRESS OF FREEDOM, INC.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Senators, ladies, and gentlemen, my name is Robert LeFevre. I am appearing as a representative of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., a nationwide organization which is a coalition of patriotic Americans drawn from nearly 500 different organizations, and groups throughout the United States. My position with the Congress of Freedom is that of executive director. I am on its board of directors and also serve on its executive committee.

I would like to take this opportunity of inviting those present to attend the convention the week of April 30. At that time, you will have the opportunity of seeing the grassroots Americans meeting in assembly to take up this very question of the United Nations.

UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL URGED

I am appearing here tonight to urge that the United States withdraw from the United Nations organization with the least possible delay. I am in opposition to any moves which might tend to amend the charter of the United Nations. I believe that from an American point of view, any permanent alliance with foreign countries, in or out of a world government, are damaging to American ideals, the American heritage, and American freedom.

The U. N. was organized ostensibly to bring peace, but it began by placing an economic and social burden on all member governments which no government of a free people is properly equipped to carry.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVITIES CRITICIZED

The Declaration, or Covenant of Human Rights, which is the very heartbeat of the U. N., sets forth a whole series of so-called rights, which are to be provided and guaranteed by these member governments. While this may be a step forward for other nations which have in truth not advanced very far into the realm of human liberty, it is a step backwards insofar as the United States is concerned.

Human liberty was the historic principle invoked at the starting of our country which found its most concise expression in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. These amendments form a prohibition against government. These amendments do not pretend to declare what government shall do for people, but instead declare what governments shall not do. There are set out things the Government must not do either for or to people.

Now, the entire central theme of the United Nations Charter, with its alleged human rights, is an abrogation of the American Bill of Rights. According to the declaration of human rights, the member governments agree to all manner of fanciful benefits, including the right to social security for every human being, of every member nation, including China and Russia, plus a guaranty of a constantly rising standing of living.

We cannot support these United Nations concepts without betraying the concepts of the United States.

FAILURES OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Now, the U. N. idea is not new. It has been tried repeatedly as a cure for war. More than 150 known attempts have been made to unite the world in a single political and economic entity to secure the peace. These date from the time of Pharaoh Menes, who succeeded in uniting the upper and lower Nile Valleys, down to the present time. That was about 3,000 B. C.

Now, every single one of these efforts has failed to bring peace. Why?

Before we answer that question, please note, there is not any purpose whatsoever in the United Nations if it cannot bring peace. Peace is what we need on this planet more than any other single commodity. Now, why have all these efforts at bringing peace failed? Why has the U. N. failed, and why will it continue to fail despite any attempts to patch it up and make it work?

Gentlemen, we must learn to understand the tools that we use. We know that a shovel is a tool, and as such it does not transmit messages. We know that a broadcasting station is a tool and it doesn't dig ditches. Every tool has been designed for a specific task.

The United Nations is a tool, just as each government member of it is a tool.

Now, let us examine this tool to see if it has been properly designed and if it can reasonably be expected to perform the task assigned to it.

All governments seek to win obedience through three devices. First, they have consent from the governed. When that fails, they resort to threats. When that fails, they use force. There is no exception to these facts in all of history.

Force is a logical extension of political power. Governments understand force. They are tools and instruments of force. Every effort in history to create world peace has been made by governments which are instruments of force. That is why all of them have failed, and will continue to fail.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. LeFevre is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ROBERT LEFEVRE

My name is Robert LeFevre. I am a news analyst and reporter, at present employed as an editorial writer on the staff of the Gazette Telegraph, a daily paper in Colorado Springs.

I am appearing as a representative of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., a nationwide organization which is a coalition of patriotic Americans drawn from nearly 500 different organizations and groups throughout the United States. My position with the Congress of Freedom is that of executive director. I am on its board of directors and also serve on its executive committee.

I am appearing here to urge that the United States withdraw from the United Nations Organization with the least possible delay. I am limiting my reasons, because of the small amount of time allotted to me, to those falling into three principal categories. They are: The record of the present United Nations, the historical record of the United Nations idea, and the fundamental philosophy and its fallacies behind any United Nations idea.

On the record, here is what the U. N. has done. It was organized ostensibly to bring peace, but it began by placing an economic and social burden on all member governments which no government of a free people is properly equipped to carry. The Declaration or Covenant of Human Rights, which is the very heartbeat of the U. N., sets forth a whole series of so-called rights which are to be provided and guaranteed by these member governments. While this may be a step forward for other nations which have, in truth, not advanced very far into the realm of human liberty, it is a step backward insofar as the United States is concerned.

Human liberty was the historic principle invoked at the starting of our country, which found its most concise expression in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. These amendments form a prohibition against government. These amendments do not pretend to declare what governments shall do for people, but instead declare that the Government shall not do certain things either for or to the people.

The entire central theme of the United Nations Charter with its alleged human rights is an abrogation of the American Bill of Rights. We cannot support these United Nations concepts without betraying the concepts of the United States.

Also on the record, the U. N. was conceived in part by convicted perjurer Alger Hiss. It has housed and continues to house a number of persons from this country whose loyalty to the United States is open to question. It advocates a loyalty oath for its employees which virtually removes them from a loyalty to America and the ideals we hold mutually as Americans.

In the realm of peacemaking the U. N. is a failure.

The U. N. made a declaration which was supposed to bring peace in Iran. In open defiance the Soviet Government refused to withdraw its troops from this country.

The U. N. attempted to solve a crisis in Greece. The U. N. representatives were not even permitted to cross the Grecian border. Instead, American general, James Van Fleet, and American money helped put down a Communist-inspired movement which came in part from Yugoslavia.

The U. N. declared a cease-fire in the U.N.-sanctioned State of Israel. Both sides here have continued to shoot at will despite the U. N.

America's U. N. allies in Korea, whose military contribution Gen. Mark Clark described as "piddling," were part of the reason for America's only military defeat as a nation. It was U. N.-inspired reasons which prohibited bombing north of the Yalu and prevented the blowing up of the bridges crossing this strategic river.

Further, Russia, a member of the U. N., took sides against the U. N. but has never been asked to leave the organization. Russia's continued role in the organization is sufficient in itself to cause America to withdraw.

When communism reared its ugly head in Guatemala, the only reason a great military disaster did not overtake American interests there is because Col. Castillo Armas, leader in Guatemala, refused to obey the U. N. advice.

At present, despite efforts made by the chief of the U. N., Dag Hammarskjold, American airmen are held prisoner in Red China, and a strong movement is underway for Red China to be admitted into the U. N.

Now to history:

The U. N. idea is not new. It has been tried repeatedly as a cure for war. More than 150 known attempts have been made to unite the world in a single political and economic entity to secure the peace. These date from the time of the great Pharaoh Menes, who succeeded in uniting the upper and lower Nile Valleys, down to the present time. They include the efforts of the great Chinese dictator Shi Huang-ti, Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon with its great tower of Babel, Alexander the Great, the union of the Greek city states under Theseus, the Great Roman Empire, the Napoleonic conquests, the Mongol and Tartar hordes under Genghis Khan and Tammerlane, and can include the efforts of Germany in World Wars I and II, together with the efforts of Hirohito, Mussolini, and many other one-worlders. These men were always for peace, because they told their followers that they were. The results of their efforts every schoolboy knows.

There was, beginning in 1898, what could be called the "modern" effort to form One World. It was instigated by the czar of Russia and culminated in the Hague Convention, World War I, the Kellogg-Briand pacts, the League of Nations, World War II, the United Nations, Korea * * * and the brink of world war III, which is where we now stand.

Every single one of these efforts has failed to bring peace. But please note. There is no purpose whatsoever in the United Nations if it cannot bring peace. Peace is what we need on this planet more than any other single commodity.

Why have all these efforts at bringing peace failed? Why has the U. N. failed, and why will it continue to fail despite any attempts to patch it up and make it work?

Here is the philosophy:

Ladies and gentlemen, we must learn to understand the tools we use. We know that a shovel is a tool, and as such it does not transmit messages. We know that a radio station is a tool and as such it does not dig ditches. Every tool has been designed for a specific task. The United Nations is a tool, just as each government member of it is a tool. Let us examine this tool to see if it has been properly designed and can reasonably be expected to perform the task assigned to it. Because it must be apparent by now, that when mankind so longs for peace and is willing to go to tremendous lengths to get it, all the efforts of the past as well as today's efforts must be in error if we are not on the way to achieving our goal.

What is the United Nations? It is a union of various member governments. What are these governments? They are all of them instruments of force. What is government except force? The very meaning of the word "government" has to do with compulsion * * * force.

All governments seek and win obedience through three devices. First they have consent from the governed. When that fails, they resort to threats. When the threats fail, they use force. There is no exception to these facts in all of history. Force is a logical extension of political power. Governments understand force. It is their natural function. Every effort in history to create world peace has been made by government. But all governments are instruments of force. Force cannot be used to bring peace. The use of force not only leads to war, it is war.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. The next witness is Mr. Howard L. Wallace.

Mr. GOOD. Following Mr. Wallace, the next witness will be Mrs. Sidney Milstein.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Wallace, we are glad to have you with us.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to be here, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Proceed, sir.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD L. WALLACE, STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Howard L. Wallace, representing the University of Denver chapter of the Students for Democratic Action.

I wish to thank the committee for extending this invitation to testify. The SDA, being dedicated to support individual rights of man and the development of social and political institutions to serve man's needs, recognizes the necessity of building world order before these principles can be realized. In the United Nations we have the only great international body attempting to establish international law and order. However, after nearly 10 years of existence, the United Nations has not fulfilled many of the purposes for which it was originally designed. Complacency and naivete contribute to the ineffectiveness of the U. N. This problem can best be resolved by a critical reappraisal of the organization's basic machinery.

STRENGTHEN AND SUPPORT THE U. N.

The U. N. has reached a stage in its development in which more support must be given to it than mere lipservice to its present charter. It should be a part of United States foreign policy to encourage and support the acceptance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by all nations. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights would further strengthen and develop the charter by placing a new and vital emphasis on the individual and his rights in the world community.

Besides strengthening the principles of the charter, the machinery of the U. N. must be strengthened so that the actual functioning of the organization may be improved. In order for the U. N. to be a truly effective world organization, there must be universal membership of all nations. SDA calls for the abolition of the veto power in the Security Council as it relates to the admittance of new members. This brings us to the problem of the entire balance of power within the U. N. framework. Greater power must be given to the General Assembly; this can be accomplished by incorporating the Uniting for Peace Resolution into the charter.

The United Nations is inalterably dedicated to the principle of the self-determination of peoples. When a question or dispute arises as to the legal control of an area, the U. N. should have the power to investigate the matter, and, if subsequent investigation should prove it advisable, assume control of the area under its trusteeship power. After a suitable length of time the inhabitants of the area should be empowered to determine their own allegiance.

BRICKER AMENDMENT OPPOSED

The executive branch of the United States Government must be left free to conduct negotiations aimed at the strengthening of the U. N. Charter. Dangerous and unprecedented legislation like the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution would hinder the effective participation of the United States in such negotiations. The most important single tool in the conduct of our foreign relations is the

President's treaty-making powers. To curtail this would be to destroy the effectiveness of our foreign policy in many other fields besides that of charter revision.

DISARMAMENT

The appalling developments during the last 10 years in scientific research and its applications to modern warfare have demonstrated that any new worldwide conflict would be devastating in its consequences. World disarmament and an international police force will eventually become unavoidable if civilization is to survive. The United Nations is logically the basic framework for such a development. So, the question of supporting the U. N. becomes one that is more than merely academic—it becomes one of survival. In the creation of a practical long-range program, the gradual disbanding of national Armed Forces and the recruitment by the U. N. of an internationally responsible police force would be necessary.

In addition to this, relocation, or pooling, of armaments for easy supervision and control by the U. N. would be provided for through international agreement.

For these reasons: Promotion of individual human rights, more workable balance of power within the U. N., effective international supervision of territorial disputes, and, perhaps most important of all, the eventual international control of armaments, the Students for Democratic Action of the University of Denver support any effective and practicable measures for strengthening the United Nations Charter.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

PAST DISARMAMENT EFFORTS

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Wallace, you know, do you not, that under the last administration as well as under this one, the Governments of the United States and other free countries of the world have made very diligent efforts to get a disarmament program that would provide for some form of effective checks, and that those efforts have been blocked by the Soviet Union?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, Senator. I think many things have been blocked by the Soviet Union many times in the United Nations.

However, that would not mean that we should stop working for this sort of thing.

President Eisenhower has just recently set up the disarmament post under Harold Stassen's governorship, and we feel that possibly the Soviet Union would give in many times if the free world united in their efforts along the same goals, and we believe that more and more of the free world is striving for disarmament. In the light of these atomic weapons and other weapons of warfare that are so appalling, we feel that possibly these nations will provide a significant effort in making the Soviet Union change its mind or change its policy in some degree.

Senator KNOWLAND. But you are also familiar with the fact that in addition to the conventional armaments, we have been trying quite diligently for a long period of time to get some type of effective con-

trol over atomic weapons as well, and that those efforts have been blocked?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I don't believe that simply because these efforts have been blocked that the efforts are simply futile.

Senator KNOWLAND. No. I am not suggesting that. But I am saying that the record should be clear that this Government under the last administration as well as under this one, has been seeking very diligently to see if there could not be found an area of agreement to permit the reduction of conventional armaments, and to permit some kind of effective control over atomic armaments.

But it is generally recognized that unless you have some effective inspection system—if you merely relied on the word of the Soviet Union without effective inspection—you would have nothing, because they have violated each of the agreements they have entered into during the last 25 years.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that is very true, Senator. But I think one thing that may help this move toward disarmament will be such things as this committee bringing it to the ground level, bringing the issue to the public. I think in the past this has been a rather pathetic subject, and people who don't know much about the proposals that have been made concerning disarmament, don't know much about the United Nations, and don't much care. And I think that the more things of this sort are brought to the American people, the more interest they will have in them.

I think this committee is long overdue.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Milstein.

Mr. Good. Following Mrs. Milstein, the next witness will be Dr. Edward C. King.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mrs. Milstein.

Mrs. MILSTEIN. Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Will you proceed, please?

STATEMENT OF MRS. SIDNEY MILSTEIN, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, DENVER SECTION

Mrs. MILSTEIN. My name is Mrs. Sidney Milstein, 1655 Jasmine Street, Denver, Colo., and I am representing, as vice president in charge of education, the Denver section of the National Council of Jewish Women.

The council was formed locally and nationally in 1893 for the purpose of furthering human welfare in the Jewish and general communities, locally, nationally, and internationally.

Through its integrated program of education, service, and social action, it provides essential services and stimulates and educates the individual and community toward their responsibility in advancing human welfare and the democratic way of life. Nationally, the National Council of Jewish Women has well over 100,000 members. In Denver, we have a membership of 1,400.

The following quotation from the preamble to the resolutions of the National Council of Jewish Women, reaffirmed just last month at its

biennial convention in New Orleans, expresses well our attitude toward the United Nations [reading]:

We believe in the interdependence of the peoples of the world and in the necessity for the active pursuance by our Government of a policy of international aid and cooperation and opposition to totalitarianism in any form, so that we may achieve a lasting peace based on justice.

I should also like to quote from resolution No. I, on American foreign policy. [Reading:]

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

The National Council of Jewish Women believes:

That the success of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and collective security and promoting the solution of economic, social, and humanitarian problems of all peoples depends on the extent to which the member states use their facilities and carry out their recommendations, even when these transcend the special interests of the member nations; and

That the United States must accept its position of leadership to help develop economic and social stability, and political democracy throughout the world: It therefore

Resolves—

1. To urge the United States to continue to participate fully in the activities and agencies of the United Nations; to support, strengthen, and implement their decisions; and whenever possible, to utilize the resources of the United Nations in the implementation of American foreign policy decisions.

2. To urge the United States to support efforts toward the transfer of sovereignty by member nations to the United Nations in those fields of activity where concerted international action can advance peace and welfare.

3. To continue to advocate:

(a) The establishment of United Nations armed forces as provided in the United Nations Charter.

(b) The regulation and reduction of armed forces and conventional and atomic armaments of individual nations, safeguarded by a system of effective international control and inspection.

4. To urge support of United Nations efforts to secure the enlightened administration of all non-self-governing territories, so as to improve the social, economic, and educational level of the inhabitants in a manner which would lead to their eventual independence.

5. To support such economic and military measures on the part of the United States and in cooperation with other nations as are necessary to strengthen the defenses of the free world.

6. To urge the United States Government to continue its aid toward the rebuilding and recovery of the nations of the world, and to aid the peoples of underdeveloped areas to build up their productive capacities in order to raise living standards and promote peace and economic security throughout the world.

7. To support the progressive reduction of tariffs by the United States on a reciprocal basis, and urge the United States Government to undertake international agreements designed to lower or remove trade barriers.

8. To encourage the expansion of hemispheric trade and cultural, educational, and economic cooperation by the full support of inter-American machinery within the framework of the United Nations.

9. To support such exercise of the treaty-making and ratification powers as will fall within the framework of the Constitution and will foster the spirit of international cooperation.

ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

For more than half a century, the National Council of Jewish Women has taken an active interest in all major efforts toward the attainment of world peace through international understanding. It has supported United States participation in international organizations since the establishment of the League of Nations. From the time of Dumbarton Oaks, Council has actively stimulated popular

support for the United Nations, United States affiliation with the specialized agencies of the United Nations, and United States ratification of the Genocide Convention and support of the Declaration of Human Rights.

At San Francisco, the National Council of Jewish Women was accorded recognition as a consultant to the United States Mission to the United Nations; and later its representative was present at United Nations conferences convened by the State Department's Office of Public Affairs. Council is a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

The National Council of Jewish Women has an observer to the United Nations accredited by the United States State Department, who reports to our membership on the programs and decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other member agencies of the United Nations.

In addition, we have attempted further support of the United Nations through direct citizen participation by issuing frequent "calls to action" to our local sections—in 245 cities throughout the country, these local sections have sponsored communitywide, non-sectarian meetings and study groups in an effort to support and extend the work of the United Nations. Denver is one of the cities where such local action and study has taken place.

FAVOR FULL DISCUSSION OF CHARTER REVIEW

In regard to the question of charter review, as set forth under article 109, we feel the present discussion can be very helpful in making more citizens aware of the United Nations and the problems it faces. We hope that those who believe in its continued importance will speak up for the necessity of renewed support by the American public. It is the feeling of the Denver section, National Council of Jewish Women, that if the conference for charter review is decided upon, all efforts must be made to strengthen, not weaken, the United Nations.

We believe that in spite of the difficulties encountered, the United Nations has a record of good achievement, and that although progress is slow, so long as all these nations with diverse interests and views are meeting together to try to reach agreement, there is still hope. We believe that all the members of the United Nations are aware of the tremendous potential power of the United Nations and that in this world of the atom bomb, they are going to hold fast to the United Nations at all costs—they know that they—and the people of the world—cannot let it fail.

We must bear in mind that the failures of the United Nations have not necessarily been due to bad present machinery of the charter—more important is the willingness of the members to cooperate, and the exercise of responsible statesmanship, which will always be necessary in order to enable the United Nations to completely fulfill the first and highest principle of the charter, to "Save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Milstein.

The next witness is Dr. Edward C. King.

Let me say, there are 10 more witnesses on the list. That will take approximately an hour. I will remind you who are interested, that

if any of you should want to file your statements, rather than appear in person, you have the privilege of doing so. We are not urging; we are simply reminding you of that opportunity.

Dr. King, we are glad to have you, sir.

Dr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee.

Senator SPARKMAN. All right, proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. EDWARD C. KING, BOULDER, COLO.

Dr. KING. My name is Edward C. King. I was born and educated in Colorado and served as a volunteer in World Wars I and II.

I have been a practicing lawyer and a banker, and more recently dean of the School of Law at the University of Colorado. In politics I am independent, uniformly voting for those candidates who in my judgment (1) believe that the democratic system of government eventually should be extended to all peoples of the world and (2) are most likely to preserve our democratic institutions and liberties here at home.

MOBILE MILITARY FORCE AND ELIMINATION OF WAR

It is my opinion that the preservation of our way of life, and even our very existence in this age of nuclear weapons, will depend upon the extent to which we adopt and make effective in practice two ideas or principles, which at first impression may seem inconsistent, but which in fact must supplement each other. These principles are the same as those expressed in the Finletter report of several years ago, namely, that we must (1) maintain the most efficient and mobile military force in the world; and (2) at the same time, and as a project of equal importance, devote our best minds and all necessary resources to the elimination of war as a means for the settlement of international disputes.

From every point of view it appears that a continuation of the arms race will soon become intolerable, not only for us but for all peoples of the world, and not only because of its cost and wastefulness but also because of its utter futility. The arms race can never result in permanent peace except by way of the destruction of one side or the other in a war in which the outcome will be in doubt. We have reached the point in history, or are approaching the point at an ever-accelerating speed, at which men will not dare use the weapons they have devised for fear of causing or inviting their own destruction. Moreover, informed leaders in every part of the world must realize that in any race conditioned upon productive capacity the odds favor the United States. They must also know that the cost of the arms race to any major participant cannot be supported indefinitely.

FINANCIAL WASTE OF ARMS RACE

The extent of the financial loss to a community may be illustrated by our situation here in Colorado by reference to Colorado's contribution to national defense.

For purposes of illustration I have used the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1953. In that year the total expendable revenues from

Colorado sources for all State purposes, such as administration, material facilities, welfare, highways, public health, and education at all levels, amounted to about 241 millions of dollars. During the same period the total contribution of Colorado taxpayers to the Federal Government was approximately 470 millions of dollars. I have estimated that of this latter sum 55 percent or 260 millions of dollars was appropriated to the Department of Defense. The source for this is: Combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, part 4, section 1, accountability for appropriations, page 342.

If we can envision a time when this latter sum, instead of being expended for war or the aftermaths of war, could be made available to the people of the State of Colorado for schools, libraries, roads, hospitals, recreational facilities, and the like, we can gain some idea of what war is costing us in terms of the good and desirable things of life.

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES TO BE COMPELLED BY U. N.

All these matters are directly related to the desirability, the practical necessity, and the political feasibility, of perpetuating the United Nations, and the need for expanding its powers and facilities until it can in fact prevent military aggression and compel the peaceable settlement of international disputes. This means nothing more nor less than the extension to the world at large of the same kind of law by means of which every nation maintains a reasonable degree of peace and safety within its own borders. It would mean the substitution of law for the government of force which now exists at the international level.

More specifically it is my judgment that the Congress of the United States should take a position in favor of extending the authority of the United Nations to such a degree as would give it power to prevent war. I think Congress should advocate such steps even if it means the withdrawal of Russia from the United Nations. A beginning must be made and it seems to me that the time has come when the nations of the world, including Russia, must declare themselves. It is my considered opinion that a positive step in the direction of the reorganization of the United Nations in such a way as to make it an effective instrument for the elimination of war would do more to reestablish confidence in the United States, and to reunite the non-Soviet world, than anything else we might do.

It is also my opinion that Congress should make such appropriations to further the ideas above expressed as may seem necessary, and that such appropriations should be in some reasonable proportion to those made for other phases of national defense. This would be further evidence of our willingness to participate in a united effort to eliminate warfare as a means of conquest or for settling international disputes.

With the coming United Nations Charter review we are offered an opportunity such as has not existed in all history to take positive and effective steps to eliminate war, and to assume the type of leadership which the world expects of democratic America. It may well be the last opportunity which man will have to save himself from destruction at his own hands.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, doctor.

Mr. Kenneth Goff.

Mr. GOOD. Following Mr. Goff, the next witness will be Mr. Elmer S. Parson.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Goff.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH GOFF, DIRECTOR, SOLDIERS OF THE CROSS, ENGLEWOOD, COLO.

Mr. GOFF. Thank you.

Honorable members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to express the following opinion in regard to the United States participation in the United Nations and in regard to the United Nations Charter on behalf of a nationwide organization called Soldiers of the Cross, with a membership of over 165,000 and with our local organization in the State of Colorado, called the Colorado Anti-Communist League, with a membership of 11,000.

First, I would like to correct the distinguished Senator who this morning in the Rocky Mountain News referred to those of us who speak against the United Nations as the rash group. I would like to correct this impression and let him know that we are the antirash group. We are opposed, and we are attempting to wipe out the Red rash which is sweeping the world at this present time.

ABOLISH THE U. N.

I would like to state further that we are opposed to the United Nations and seek its abolishment. I am here to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

The United Nations has been in existence for 10 years. In that period of time, it has not halted the encroachment of communism on the free world. During this period of time the Communists have added to their orbit many of the nations of Europe and Asia, comprising over 650 million peoples. It is our firm belief, had the United States not been shackled by the do-nothing United Nations, a major portion of these people would be free today.

The reason for the Communist victories can well be found in the fact that the Russian Government is a major member in good standing in the very organization which seeks to contain it. This, in itself, is as asinine as a gangster being a member of the local police department, which is seeking to outlaw gangsterism.

As long as Russia continues under the tyranny of Communist imperialism it will not be a United Nations, but a divided nations organization. Those who overlook this fundamental can unwittingly strengthen the Kremlin's hand in its phony proposals for world union; which merely means world surrender.

The Communist growth in the world has been the greatest during the United Nations period, for it has found this organization a true helper for shouting peace, at any price, while the Red Armies gobble up territory after territory. Through the United Nations, Russia has a perfect propaganda machine by which she can bring her deceitful and sordid reasons to the masses of Asia, Europe, and China for con-

quering other territories. Usually the reason set forth is to protect the little nations from American imperialism.

U. N. NOT FOR PROMOTION OF PEACE

Since the advent of the United Nations the prestige of the United States has not been enhanced abroad. The enemies of our Nation have used the news channels of the United Nations and its many council meetings as instruments through which they could propagandize the world, throwing evil light on America's foreign policy. This is being brought more into the open daily by anti-American riots in many nations.

And I submitted in my report, which I will not give completely, the nations in which these anti-American riots are taking place.

While the United Nations proposes peace for the world, today we are further from peace than at any time in the history of mankind. The world is sitting on a powder keg, which could go off at any moment. It can truly be said that everywhere mankind is beating their plowshares into swords, and are preparing for world war III. Since 1945 we have had over 3,000 peace conferences with Soviet Russia and the only peace obtained has been at the price of one-fourth of the earth's surface, and 650 million people who have been virtually delivered on a golden platter into the hands of the Kremlin.

Peace is not a product of law, but is an expression of the human soul. The fundamental teaching of the Christian faith explains in no uncertain terms that war and murder cannot be halted by law alone. We have more laws today on our statute books inflicting penalties upon those who commit homicide, yet we have more murder today than in all the history of the world. We may sign a million peace treaties, blow up every battleship, destroy every atom bomb, demilitarize every army, and dismantle every weapon of death. This will not insure peace, for mankind will shape weapons out of other material and seek to destroy one another.

Time does not permit me to give the rest of my statement, but I have incorporated it in the manuscript which has been given to you.

Senator SPARKMAN. It will all be printed in the record.

Mr. GOFF. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Goff.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Goff is as follows:)

SOLDIERS OF THE CROSS,
Englewood, Colo., April 6, 1955.

FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE.

HONORABLE SIRs: I wish to express the following opinion in regard to the United Nations Organization and the United Nations Charter, on behalf of a nationwide organization called Soldiers of the Cross, with a membership of 165,000, and also on behalf of the Colorado Anti-Communist League, with a membership of 11,000. The statements appearing in this document have been adopted by both these organizations, as their official opinion in regard to this matter. I wish to state in the very beginning, that we are unequivocally opposed to the United Nations and, therefore, seek its abolishment, because of the reasons set forth in this document.

(1) The United Nations has been in existence now for 10 years, as of this month. In that period of time, it has not halted the encroachment of communism on the free world. During this period of time, the Communists have

added to their orbit many of the nations of Europe and Asia, comprising over 650 million peoples. It is our firm belief, had the United States not been shackled by the do-nothing United Nations, a major portion of these people would be free today.

The reason for the Communist victories can well be found in the fact that the Russian Government is a major member in good standing in the very organization which seeks to contain it. This, in itself, is as asinine as a gangster being a member of the local police department, which is seeking to outlaw gangsterism.

As long as Russia continues under the tyranny of Communist imperialism, it will not be a United Nations, but a divided nations organization. Those who overlook this fundamental can unwittingly strengthen the Kremlin's hand in its phony proposals for world union, which merely means world surrender.

The Communist growth in the world has been the greatest during the United Nations period; for it has found this organization a true helper for shouting peace, at any price, while the Red armies gobble up territory after territory. Through the United Nations, Russia has a perfect propaganda machine, by which she can bring her deceitful and sordid reasons to the masses of Asia, Europe, and China, for conquering other territories. Usually the reason set forth is to protect the little nations from American imperialism.

(2) Since the advent of the United Nations, the prestige of the United States has not been enhanced abroad. The enemies of our Nation have used the new channels of the United Nations and its many council meetings, as instruments through which they could propagandize the world; throwing evil light on America's foreign policy. This is being brought more into the open daily by anti-American riots in many nations. These are a few examples:

In Mexico, our nearest Latin neighbor, large numbers of workers and students demonstrated against the United States, and the police had to protect 400 United States Korean war veterans from their wrath. In Honduras, a nation which has cooperated with us in our fight against communism, large numbers of students from their universities have carried on demonstrations against what they call Wall Street imperialism, which have ended in bloody rioting. In Panama last year, the students called a 24-hour strike against the United States. In Cuba, there was a 24-hour strike and demonstration against the United States, with a stoning of the offices of the United Press and the North American Electric Co. Flaming manifestos were distributed, attacking what they called Yankee imperialism. In Bolivia, students paraded before the United States Embassy and shouted, "Down with the United States." They were supported in their action by the powerful labor movements of that country. In Argentina, the presses have been carrying on a heavy campaign against what they call United States imperialism. In Chile, the Chamber of Deputies voted 34 to 15 against the United States and our aid to Guatemala. The workers and students paraded in their capital city before the United States Embassy, burning the flag of the United States and an effigy of President Eisenhower. The offices of two Chilean newspapers favorable to the United States were stoned.

These are a few of the many reports coming in daily of a growing hatred toward the United States from all parts of the world.

The United Nations has never cleared before the eyes of the world, America's action in Korea. The statements of the Russian Government at all the council hearings have left a question in the minds of the people everywhere, outside the orbit of our friends.

(3) While the United Nations proposes peace for the world, today we are further from peace than at any time in the history of mankind. The world is sitting on a powder keg, which could go off at any moment. It can truly be said that everywhere mankind is beating their plowshares into swords, and are preparing for world war III. Since 1945, we have had over 3,000 peace conferences with Soviet Russia and the only peace obtained has been at the price of one-fourth of the earth surface and 650 million people, who have been virtually delivered on a golden platter into the hands of the Kremlin.

Peace is not a product of law, but is an expression of the human soul. The fundamental teaching of the Christian faith explains in no uncertain terms that war and murder cannot be halted by law alone. We have more laws today on our statute books inflicting penalties upon those who commit homicide, yet we have more murder today than in all the history of the world. We may sign a million peace treaties, blow up every battleship, destroy every atom bomb, demilitarize every army, and dismantle every weapon of death. This will not

insure peace; for mankind will shape weapons out of other material and seek to destroy one another.

What the United Nations has overlooked, is the fact that it does not contain the power to remove from the hearts of men, greed and lust. Jesus Christ stated in one of the closing messages of his last week here on earth, that we would have wars right up to the end of the age, and that the age would end in a war.

The Bible says, "Let God be true, and every man a liar," and it is our firm conviction that God is true; and therefore, the United Nations cannot be the instrument through which peace will be brought to mankind. It can only come with the ushering-in of the kingdom of our Christ.

(4) The world government, which is the ultimate aim of the promoters of the United Nations; would certainly result in world communism. It is much easier for the Communist to win control of one central world organization, than to capture 72 separate governments.

The basic philosophy of the member nations of the United Nations is not that of our free enterprise system or our republican way of life. The majority of the governments, who hold membership in the United Nations, are either semitotalitarian, Socialist, or Communist in their doctrine and way of life.

Under the present charter, our acceptance of the United Nations in treaty form has created new and unforeseen dangers. It has established virtually a government above our government, and has placed the sovereignty of our 48 States in jeopardy. As you learned gentlemen already know, our Constitution holds that, "All treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land. Anything in the Constitution or the law of the States to the contrary notwithstanding." Should in the future the United Nations make the Genocide Act a part of their law, or should they take it upon themselves to endorse socialism or communism as a basic economy for the governments of the world, we would be bound by that action. It was not the intent of our Founding Fathers, nor that of the majority of the Americans today, that any power should be vested in any alien government or world organization, which would supersede the authority of our Congress or violate the sovereignty of our States. We could well take warning from our first President, George Washington, who said, "Friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

While there is no fear in our minds that the present Congress would allow such a thing to come to pass, we must be mindful of the fact, that a generation from now, might find men in office with evil intent and purposes, who would carry out the very act of abolishing our present system and way of life and betray us by law into the hands of a Red world supergovernment. Our strength is in our Christian heritage and our free enterprise system. This would be destroyed in any world supergovernment. Next to religious faith, the deepest of spiritual emotions, are love of country and patriotism. These emotions are embedded in the struggles and sacrifices, to maintain independence; they embrace constructive ideals, unity of purpose and symbols; all of which would be greatly injured or reduced in vitality by being melted into a foreign alloy. Being a minority in a supergovernment, the political, economic, and social control of our country would utterly pass from our own hands, and all the assurances of our fundamental institutions would be lost.

(5) The failure of the United Nations and the danger of our being allied to it could clearly be seen in the Korean police action. Here was an example of a United Nations army working under a divided command. This resulted in America's first defeat in the history of our Nation, and the futile spilling of the blood of 140,000 of the cream of American youth, in a war of appeasement, which the United Nations never intended to win; and which the enemies of our Nation used, to bring America into reproach, and to display us as weak in the eyes of the world. This instability and weakness on the part of the United Nations has been repeated in Indochina, and at present in the Formosa crisis. It has placed our country in a position where we are being weighted down by an organization, which speaks much, and acts little, and allows the enemy to bluff its way to power.

(6) We oppose the United Nations, because we believe that it has placed in the largest city in America and in the gateway to our Nation, a Trojan Horse, through which the enemy has free access to our land. Under the headquarters agreement between the United Nations and the United States, signed in August 1947, we agreed that no police or military officer would have a right to enter the U. N. district to perform any duty without consent of the Secretary General of the United Nations. This made the U. N. capital in New York City a nation within a nation, and caused part of the United States be under the jurisdiction of a foreign government.

This agreement also provided that the delegates to the U. N. and their staffs should enjoy the same diplomatic privileges as are given to foreign envoys in our country. We agreed to let enter into our country through the United Nations: The representatives of member nations and their families, experts performing missions for the U. N., press, radio, and film agents of other nations, representatives of nongovernmental organizations recognized by the United Nations, and all persons whom the United Nations and its agents wish to invite on business. This act alone opened the door of America to hundreds of alien Reds; and placed the Kremlin spy ring as close to their operatives in America, as the nearest phone booth in the United Nations headquarters. The Federal grand jury investigating disloyalty of certain United States citizens at the U. N., which issued its report on December 2, 1952, showed quite clearly the tremendous amount of Communist intrigue that is going on under cover of the United Nations in New York City.

(7) We further oppose the United Nations, because we believe that many of the subsidiary organizations working under it are seeking to undermine our American way of life. In our opinion, UNESCO is a subversive association. It is conscientiously furthering a campaign calculated to pervert the teaching profession in this country and so destroy the worth and integrity of America's first bulwark of freedom, our tax-supported public schools. Through their efforts, they may shortly transform our schools into laboratories for the systematic destruction of all sense of national allegiance and loyalty in the minds and hearts of our American school child.

We have attached to this document a booklet written by Rev. Kenneth Goff, called *One World, a Red World*, which sets forth in clear terms, the danger facing our Nation because of our alliance with Godless Russia and her allies. We submit this booklet as a part of our report and endorse its contents as a whole. (The booklet referred to is on file with the committee.)

History has proven that the nations which have walked with God have risen to great heights and contributed much to the advancement of civilization, but every nation which has waived from this principle and allied itself with ungodly forces, has suffered the consequences and has become a scrap heap upon the pages of civilization. The Bible, which has been the foundation of our way of life and the bulwark of our freedom, plainly teaches that no Christian individual, or Christian nation, should be yoked with unbelievers.

To believe that we have strength in unity with Russia, is to perpetrate the devil's lie and to make of Satan, an angel of light.

We can rightfully imagine that Daniel Webster was looking to this very hour, when our Nation would be subjugating its liberties to a world organization, when he wrote this message of warning:

"Other misfortunes may be borne and their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation will renew it. If it exhausts our Treasury, future industry will replenish it. If it desolates and lays waste our fields; still under a new cultivation they will grow again and ripen under future harvests.

"But who can reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who can rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional architecture, which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again."

In conclusion, let us say that we firmly hope that you, in whose hands the people of this Nation have placed the destiny of our future, will weigh carefully this tremendous question of the surrender of any of our sovereign rights to a world superstate.

With sincere thanks for this opportunity to express our will and desire, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

For the Cause of Christ and America:

[SEAL]

KENNETH GOFF, *Director*,

FRANK SHEPHERD, *Member of Board of Directors*,

ELLEN WILSON, *Secretary Treasurer*,

Soldiers of the Cross.

Senator SPARKMAN. The next witness is Mr. Elmer S. Parson.

Mr. GOOD. Following Mr. Parson, the next witness will be Mr. Moore.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Parson, we are glad to have you, sir.

Mr. PARSON. Thank you, sir.

**STATEMENT OF ELMER S. PARSON, AMERICANISM CHAIRMAN,
LEYDEN-CHILES-WICKERSHAM POST NO. 1, THE AMERICAN
LEGION, DENVER, COLO.**

Mr. PARSON. I am Elmer Parson, Americanism chairman for the Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post of the American Legion, the world's largest post in the world's largest veterans' organization, having a membership of over 11,000.

The American Legion has supported the United Nations from the beginning and believes that it can and should keep the peace.

The constant misuse of the veto power by the Soviet Union, together with its numerous uncooperative actions, makes it clear that the United Nations Charter must be amended in such manner as to make the United Nations the effective force for peace which the people of the world desire.

LEGION SUGGESTIONS

Early in 1946, the American Legion recognized the above facts and publicly stated its ideas as to charter amendment. These ideas have been publicly restated every year since then and their essence, which the Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post No. 1, American Legion, Department of Colorado, approves is as follows:

1. There shall be a removal of the veto power in the matters of aggression or preparation for aggression.

2. There shall be a limitation of world arms through the establishment of arms quotas guaranteed by a system of positive international inspection; this shall also include the control of atomic energy.

3. There shall be the establishment of an effective tryanny-proof international police force composed of an active independent force under the direction of the Security Council and a reserve force of national contingents.

Under United Nations Charter Article 51, the American Legion approves the establishment of a regional pact of Pacific and Far Eastern free nations.

The American Legion is opposed to any form of world federation or world government. It is opposed to any amendment of the United Nations Charter which will foster the furtherance of world government.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Parson.

Mr. Gordon Moore.

Mr. GOOD. Following Mr. Moore, the next witness will be Dr. Neal Bishop.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you with us. Just go right ahead, sir.

STATEMENT OF GORDON MOORE, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUB, SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Gordon Moore. I live at 2245 South High Street, and attend South High School. I am appearing on behalf of the South High School International Relations Club.

The South High School International Relations Club is an organization composed of 60 students. The object of the club, as stated in its constitution, is to further among the students an interest in world affairs and in the cause of world peace and brotherhood.

After some study of the United Nations Charter and possible revisions of it, proposals have been suggested by members of the club and agreed upon by a majority of the membership.

Security force

The first proposal is that a standing security force should be established under the control of the Security Council, to be used to stop any aggression or breach of peace in the world when it is necessary. This standing force is to be manned and financed in a proportional manner similar to the way in which the other activities of the United Nations are handled.

The group supports this measure for the following reasons:

1. Article 43 of the United Nations Charter provides that—

All members * * * in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, * * * for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in their report (S. Ex. Rept. 8, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) on the United Nations Charter stated that—

the committee is convinced that any reservation to the charter, or any subsequent congressional limitation designed to provide, for example, that employment of the Armed Forces of the United States to be made available to the Security Council under special agreements referred to in article 43 could be authorized only after the Congress had passed on each individual case would clearly violate the spirit of one of the most important provisions of the charter.

One of the fundamental purposes of the charter is to provide forces which will be immediately available to the Security Council to take action to prevent a breach of the peace.

3. We, therefore, feel, after considering reasons 1 and 2, that it would be in the best interest of the United States to keep this proposal in mind when considering possible revisions to the charter. If such forces are to be supplied at the request of the Security Council, we feel it would be better if this initial security force were under their direct control.

Veto power

The second proposal is that the veto power should be changed in certain cases so that it cannot be used to block action in the United Nations. We feel that the veto power should be eliminated in the following cases:

1. The admission of new members under chapter II, article 4, clause 2, of the charter.

2. The suspending and reinstating of members under chapter II, article 5 of the charter.

3. The expulsion of a member under chapter II, article 6 of the charter.

Due to the fact that the veto has been used 28 times to keep new members from being admitted, we feel this change should be considered.

Specialized agencies

The third proposal recommends that there should be a closer coordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The group feels that the various agencies could be more effectively run if they were under a more direct control of the United Nations. They feel that at the present time, even though there is a coordinating committee between these agencies, there is a possibility of a great deal of duplication of effort.

Under the present conditions each agency has to establish separate channels for their action, where if it were under the direct control of the U. N., all the agencies could use a few basic channels.

Scientific research

The fourth and final proposal of the group deals with scientific research. It is our opinion that a great deal is to be gained by furthering scientific research. We would like to suggest the establishment of a commission devoted to the study of scientific problems and their solution.

Each member nation of the United Nations would loan a few of their top scientists to this commission from time to time. This commission would undertake research in the various fields of science and their findings would be available to all the nations. We feel that such a scientific commission through this type of research could do a great deal toward the betterment of mankind.

The members of the South High School International Relations Club would like to thank this committee for the privilege of appearing before the committee and presenting their proposals for possible changes in the United Nations Charter.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Moore.

Dr. Neal Bishop.

Mr. GOOD. Following Dr. Bishop, the next witness will be Mr. John Nelson.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Dr. Bishop.

STATEMENT OF DR. NEAL D. BISHOP, DENVER, COLO.

Dr. BISHOP. I am Neal Bishop. I live at 439 South Emerson. I am a doctor of chiropractic, and a member of the Colorado State Senate.

I am not a pacifist, by any means, but I am in favor of world government. I put in 12 years in the armed services, and despite this isolationist applause that you have heard here so frequently this evening, I want to assure you that that does not represent a majority opinion in this region.

It is well known that I am a member of the United World Federalists, and a number of such organizations seeking means eventually to establish world government.

EVENTUAL WORLD GOVERNMENT FAVORED

The American Legion said in their statement that they are not in favor of world government at this time. Well, certainly no one in their right mind could be in favor of world government at this time, because none of the vast number of preliminary steps have been taken or even seriously considered in many instances.

I want to read a resolution that was passed by this largest post of the American Legion. You have just heard my friend, Elmer Parson, the Americanism chairman, speak from this post. [Reading:]

Whereas the American Legion has had for one of its cardinal principles "making right the master of might," and whereas, the armed might of nations has become an imminent threat to the existence of life on this planet; and whereas, right can best be implemented through the establishment of binding and enforceable laws among men; and whereas, the United Nations organization constitutes the sole effort of humanity at this time to avoid destruction and to provide a stable civilization for future generations; * * * now therefore be it resolved that the American Legion calls upon our representatives in Washington and men of good will everywhere to uphold the United Nations, to strengthen its charter, amend the constitutions of this and other countries to the end that mankind may live together under binding and enforceable law as becomes our present stage of evolution * * *

Now, that resolution was passed by the American Legion post, not unanimously. It went to the State and national organization, and by a margin of one vote was defeated in the State.

But now, what I would like to bring to the attention of this group here, visiting Colorado—and I think any one sitting and listening to this sort of testimony all evening deserves the pay raise that they got recently—I think that you should know that this is not an isolationist community. The people who elected me to the State senate here four times gave me the highest designation, gave me the highest vote in my party, and they did that fully mindful of the fact that I stand for an approach to world government and strengthening the United Nations and doing it as quickly as possible.

My feeling is that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should now advocate charter review, formalize any areas of agreement found in the disarmament commission, and since no major power will give up the veto until all voting weights in the Assembly are changed, I would respectfully recommend the advocacy by your committee of the Greenville Clarke-Sohn weight formula.

Thank you very much, indeed.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Senator.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Bishop is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF NEAL D. BISHOP

In 1920 I engaged in an intercollegiate debate favoring the ratification of the League of Nations by the United States Senate. Preparation for that debate sold me on the fact that a limited type of world government is the ultimate answer to permanent world peace. Since that time I have belonged to and been intensely active in seven great organizations, studying and exploring rational roads to international unity under enforceable law.

You may recall that the 1948 platform of the Democratic Party included this statement: "We believe that the community of nations established through the United Nations represents our best hope for establishment of peace, and that positive steps must be taken to strengthen the United Nations as quickly as possible. Recent events have demonstrated that the United Nations must be given additional powers and machinery for maintaining peace. We hope, therefore, that a general conference of the United Nations should be called at once

to consider amendments to the charter which will enable the United Nations to enact, interpret, and enforce world law upon individual violators for the prevention of war."

In a democracy we have individual freedom and consequently inescapable individual responsibility. It will matter little if we have good housing, good roads, pensions, and F. E. P. C., etc., and then all perish in atomic fission. Social reforms, free enterprise, or sovereignty will be of little use to cinders.

Five years ago, I secured the passage of the following resolution in America's largest American Legion post. The resolution stated in part:

"Whereas the American Legion has had for one of its cardinal principles 'making right the master of might'; and

"Whereas the armed might of nations has become an imminent threat to the existence of life on this planet; and

"Whereas right can best be implemented through the establishment of binding and enforceable laws among men; and

"Whereas the United Nations organization constitutes the sole effort of humanity at this time to avoid destruction and to provide a stable civilization for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion calls upon our representatives in Washington and men of good will everywhere to uphold the United Nations to strengthen its charter, amend the constitutions of this and other countries to the end that mankind may live together under binding and enforceable law as becomes our present stage of evolution * * *."

The American Legion statement of policy on foreign relations was:

1. The American Legion plan for strengthening the United Nations, originally passed by the national executive committee in November 1946, provides the essential basic requirements of, and first steps toward, true worldwide enforcement of law and order, which is the immediate necessity.

2. That the countries of the North Atlantic pact join forces within the United Nations to insist on the amending of the United Nations Charter to accomplish the objectives of the American Legion plan. In this way the democratic nations of the West would thereby declare to the world their intention of making the United Nations an effective authority for peace.

We retain our faith in the United Nations. We believe that it can be an effective world authority which can prevent aggression if the charter is amended immediately as suggested by the American Legion in November of 1946—to accomplish the following:

1. Removal of the veto power in the two specific instances of matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression.

2. Adoption of United States proposals for the international control of atomic energy and establishment of arms quotas, both to be guaranteed through a system of positive international inspection.

3. Establishment of an effective tyranny-proof international police force. This force would consist of two parts—an independent active force to be under the direct control of the security council and a reserve force made up of the national contingent of the major powers capable of backing up the active forces when necessary.

The result would be that the United Nations through an effective police force, would enforce its decisions, prevent aggression and the preparation of aggression, and so maintain the peace.

We believe that the American Legion plan for strengthening the United Nations provides the basic requirements of, and the first step toward, true worldwide enforcement of law and order, which is the immediate necessity.

"The American Legion is opposed to any form of world federation or world government at this time."

No federation or world government at this time.

How could anybody in his right mind be for world government at this time? We have taken none of the absolutely necessary time-consuming preliminary steps to world federation which the Legion foreign-affairs committee and all other international students suggest.

This has been a widely misunderstood statement. Those opposing the Legion stand interpret the statement to support many diverse contentions.

Alarmists paint a horrible picture of conditions that would exist if the world in its present sorry plight were suddenly unified under one central government.

Naturally any nation which aspires to a position of leadership must show good faith by amending its own constitution and recommending amendments to the United Nations charter that would be necessary steps toward world government as proposed by the Legion.

There are three general ideas of what should constitute world government. They are described as the minimal, medial, and maximal.

The minimal is accurately expressed in the Legion statement on foreign policy.

Maximal world government with broad powers for control of trade, currency, etc., is the bugaboo our critics describe and claim that is what we are advocating. It may come in 100 years but I doubt it.

Many of us feel today that our Congress, President, and State Department should launch an all-out, double-barreled peace offensive—keeping our opposition in Moscow off balance and constantly on the defensive. We admit that it will at best be a long, rough road and a fighting chance, but we should grasp what chance there is and bend our best effort to arouse a world-shaking, curtain-cracking, mental and spiritual awakening to match our armament effort since both are necessary to prevent the third and final war.

It is my feeling that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should now advocate charter review, formalize any areas of agreement found in the Disarmament Commission, and since no major power will give up the veto till all voting weights in the Assembly are changed, I would respectfully recommend the advocacy of the Grenville Clarke-Sohn weight formula.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. John Nelson.

Mr. GOOD. Following Mr. Nelson, the next witness will be Mr. Guy Fox.

STATEMENT OF JOHN O. NELSON, THE UNITED NATIONS STUDY GROUP OF BOULDER, BOULDER, COLO.

Mr. NELSON. My name is John Nelson. I am a teacher. I am speaking for the United Nations Study Group of Boulder, a small group of citizens who, since it began to study the United Nations, has become very worried about the welfare, the continued welfare, of this country and the preservation of our liberties.

CONTRADICTIONS IN CHARTER ASSERTED

Article 2, section 7, of the U. N. Charter states that—

nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

On the other hand, one finds in the U. N. Charter articles which state that rights and freedom—and presumably duties—shall be “without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion” (art. 1, sec. 3); one finds articles which state that the United Nations shall promote full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development (art. 55 a, b); also universal respect for and observance of human rights without distinction of race, sex, or religion (art. 55 c); articles which state that member nations shall pledge themselves to act in cooperation with the Organization for the promotion and achievement of the above-stated ends (art. 56); articles which state that the U. N. shall form agencies, known as specialized agencies, to carry out the above-mentioned aims (arts. 57 and following).

Now it is certainly the case that questions as to whether citizens shall have equal rights irrespective of sex, religion, race, or language; questions as to whether there shall or shall not be full employment within a state; questions as to whether there shall be economic “development” or not within a state—these are all matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign state and have always been so.

There exists, therefore, a contradiction in the articles of the U. N. Charter: a contradiction between article 2, section 7, which states that—

nothing in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state—and the articles cited above, which authorize the United Nations and its agencies to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state. We know from logic that inconsistent premises cannot be tolerated, since from them anything whatsoever may be deduced. Clearly, therefore, either article 2, section 7 must be eliminated from the charter or those articles inconsistent with it must be eliminated: namely, among others, article 1, section 3 and articles 55 through 72, which authorize and establish intervention in matters essentially domestic.

ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES ADVISED

We, the United Nations Study Group of Boulder, assert that article 1, section 3, and articles 55 through 72, and any other articles which violate article 2, section 7 by establishing or authorizing intervention in essentially domestic affairs, must be eliminated from the charter, if the United States is to remain in the U. N. Our reasons are the following:

First: The United States Senate ratified the charter with the explicit understanding, and only upon the pre-sumption—hasty as it now appears—that article 2, section 7 would not be violated.

Second: The basic purpose of the U. N. Organization is incontestably the prevention of war. But nothing, we contend, is more calculated to produce war and warlike strife than the intervention of external agencies into matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign state.

I should like to add a remark to the written text at this point. I think a qualification is needed to the suggestion that intervention in domestic concerns by external agencies is calculated necessarily to produce war and warlike strife. We shall admit that if the U. N. were given a military force, with a monopoly on hydrogen bombs, it could intervene in domestic affairs without fear of producing strife.

By sufficiently brutal measures and threats it could maintain intervention without fear of contradiction. But what worries us is this: What and who is the U. N.? Who shall control it? Who shall be entrusted with our liberties and welfare? Men or gods? Or is the U. N. a platonic forum?

Since articles 1, section 3 and articles 55 through 72 constitute such intervention, and since they violate article 2, section 7 and thus the premises of United States entry into the U. N., we assert that articles 1, section 3 and articles 55–72, and any of like nature and purpose, must be eliminated from the U. N. Charter.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Fox.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. Fox, the next witness will be Dr. Alfred C. Nelson.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Fox.

STATEMENT OF GUY FOX, BOARD OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS, COLORADO CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, WHEATRIDGE, COLO.

Mr. Fox. Mr. Chairman and Senator Knowland, my name is Guy Fox, of Wheatridge, Colo., retired public-school administrator. I am representing the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Colorado Conference of the Methodist Church. This conference is composed of 210 congregations with a membership of approximately 80,000 individuals.

We wish to commend the committee on these hearings. We sincerely hope they are a help to you in discharging the great responsibility that has been placed in your hands, and we know that they are a stimulus to us as citizens in discharging more faithfully our responsibilities relative to this problem.

In representing the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Churches of this area, I wish to report to you specific recommendations prepared just a year ago by our board and distributed to every church of the conference for study and comment. They were then amended in response to the suggestions received, presented to the annual conference of ministers and laymen in June of 1954, and were approved by that conference. I quote in part from the statement of the board:

Besides the power of our collective faith and prayer, the United Nations remains the best tool to bring about peace in a world beset with danger. Charter revision will be considered in 1955 and we as Methodists should do our part to see that it is used for further strengthening of the United Nations. * * *

We, therefore, recommend that our ministers should—first, build a favorable atmosphere within our congregations, based on faith, prayer, and Christian responsibility—by using every instrument of organizations within the church to implant in men's minds the needs for peace and Christian action, so that when the time arises for the latter we Methodists will be ready and not found wanting.

We recommend specifically that the conference authorize the peace subcommittee to organize the implementation of the Bishops' Crusade for World Order, including the appointment of district peace secretaries. * * * We urge that in preparation for the crusade, each local church organize its own peace committee. Our goal is to make every Methodist a legislative missionary on this matter.

CHARTER RECOMMENDATIONS

In the field of strengthening the United Nations and charter revision, we specifically recommend the following:

1. That the United Nations be strengthened so that an agreement can be reached on disarmament, enforced by international inspection and backed by law.

2. We recommend universality of membership.

3. That the United Nations be empowered to have an effective inspection police force with full and free access into any country to enforce international law against aggressive armament, and should have the power to arrest individual offenders on international court order.

4. That the United States should contribute more liberally to the humanitarian agencies of the United Nations; particularly the Technical Assistance Program, the Children's Emergency Fund, and the Refugee Emergency Fund; and that the present areas of world service should be enlarged.

5. That the peaceful potentials of an atomic age should be furthered by additional research, and that we approve President Eisenhower's plan for pooling atomic materials for constructive, peaceful purposes.

6. That the United Nations should be the vehicle to settle all international disputes that threaten the peace of the world. No nation or group of nations should be allowed to engage in unilateral action in dealing with such problems.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, some of these recommendations will not be easily or quickly achieved, and I assure you that we have no specific blueprint for their achievement. Nevertheless, we felt that you would be interested in the conclusions that we reached and in the action that we have taken; and we do want you to know how deeply and sincerely we hope that our country will continue to work with persistence, with sensitivity and with all the skill at our command toward the solution of problems that block the road to international cooperation and peace.

We should like to add that what we are attempting to do here in Colorado and Utah is only an integral part of what is being attempted by the Methodist Church throughout the Nation and world; and that our denomination, of course, is working closely with the National and World Councils of Churches toward these goals of international cooperation and world peace.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Any questions?

CHARTER AND CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Fox, I have just two questions on your third and sixth paragraphs on page 2. In the third paragraph you suggest—

that the United Nations be empowered to have an effective inspection police force with full and free access into any country to enforce international law against aggressive armament, and should have the power to arrest individual offenders on international court order.

We have under our own Constitution certain safeguards in the Bill of Rights, including trial by jury, and a person is held innocent until proven guilty under our Anglo-Saxon concept of law, which they do not have in the Communist countries, where we get more of a drumhead operation.

Has your commission considered safeguards that could correspond with the American Bill of Rights, or is this an unlimited power to seize and to try?

Mr. Fox. I can't answer that the committee has gone into detail there. From our discussion, and using my personal judgment to a certain extent, I would certainly say there should be safeguards.

Now, just what specifically would have to be worked out? I do feel that this country cannot say, "We have the only way of doing things: we have the right way, and we must insist in all detail on what we have used in the past."

This must be a situation of give and take.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is true, I think, up to a point, at least.

Mr. Fox. Yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. But the Constitution was, I think, drafted by some men who were very wise and who knew the history of the world up to that time. I think it was drafted under divine guidance at Philadelphia, and I cannot help but believe that the safeguards they wrote into it came out of their experience with tyrannies from time immemorial. Consequently, it does seem to me that we have to be certain that we are not diluting the fundamental freedoms of man

on the moral basis of our rights as individuals as compared to the state.

And unless you had some guaranties, you could very well eliminate in fairly short order all the protections that we have.

Mr. Fox. I am sure our committee would agree that there must be safeguards carefully thought out; yes, indeed.

INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE

Senator KNOWLAND. Then in your paragraph 6 you mention that—the United Nations should be the vehicle to settle all international disputes that threaten the peace of the world. No nation or group of nations should be allowed to engage in unilateral action in dealing with such problems.

Has your committee given consideration to the problem of self-defense that a nation might have? As an example, suppose again an invasion took place in the Republic of Korea. If they have no power to take action, they are helpless until the United Nations acts. If the United Nations fails to act for 10 days, or if the Soviet Union is able to exercise a veto and prevent action, maybe the country loses its freedom entirely, before any resistance is undertaken.

You would not put the victim in the position of having his hands tied behind himself, and unable to defend himself until the United Nations could act, would you?

Mr. Fox. Senator, our committee did not go into all the details in this brief statement. It is so frequently stated in the Charter of the United Nations that the right of a nation to defend itself—I think we have just assumed that that would be recognized.

Senator KNOWLAND. I just wanted to clarify what you have said.

Mr. Fox. Certainly. I am sure that would be true. That was your purpose.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Fox.

Dr. Alfred C. Nelson.

Mr. Good. Following Dr. Nelson, the final witness of the hearing will be Mr. Philip Frieder.

Senator SPARKMAN. Dr. Nelson, we are glad to have you, sir.

STATEMENT OF DR. ALFRED C. NELSON, DENVER, COLO.

Dr. NELSON. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and those distinguished members on the platform, I am Alfred C. Nelson, dean of Community College of the University of Denver.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to present my viewpoint on the very important matter of the review of the Charter of the United Nations and its possible revision. Though I do not formally represent the university as an institution I am confident that my comments will reflect the majority, if not all, of the attitudes and opinions of my colleagues with regard to the place of the United Nations in the international aspects of our current scene.

NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL AGENCY

In the first place, my observations of the complexity of the economic, cultural, and political patterns in Europe, based upon a recent visit there, and the corresponding rapid developments in other parts of

the world, leads me to the conclusion that some form of international agency is essential to provide a common meeting ground for the analysis and evaluation of international problems. The establishment of the United Nations, with whatever imperfections are still inherent in its operation, represents a major step in providing a medium for concerted action to maintain the complicated balance necessary if peaceful solutions to the complex problems of our modern world society are to be found. The charter, with so much similarity in its objectives and principles to our own United States Constitution, affords a working document which in my judgment is fundamental to international understanding.

VALUE OF THE U. N.

The generally little known or recognized contributions toward eliminating the causes of tension and conflict which have been made by the various agencies operating under the United Nations are a most significant factor toward creating a stable world order. It is unfortunate that so much emphasis has been placed on the elements of conflict which so often enter into the operation of an organization as complex as the United Nations. There are many factors of great value in its impact on the world situation which should be emphasized, but which are overlooked or minimized because they are not spectacular.

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP REQUIRED

In my judgment, it is essential to the peace of the world that the United States accept the responsibility of using its leadership for the maintenance of a cooperative relationship among all nations. It must not relinquish its position to the individual pressure politics of other nations as was done when we so inadvisedly failed to play our part in the League of Nations, with the tragic results which have been and are still being experienced.

There are ample evidence of hatemongering groups, hiding behind the front of what they call patriotism, seeking by falsehood and other means to render the United Nations impotent. They would have us return to an isolationist position which, whether we like it or not, is impossible because of the incompatibility of such a position with the realistic situation in the world today. They would destroy the only instrument available at the present time for some semblance of orderly solution to the normal conflicts of desire and need which are bound to arise in our complex world order.

It is my hope that the Senate of the United States and others charged with determining our foreign relations policy will not yield to these ill-advised, and often unfair, attacks upon the United Nations and the agencies created by it to make possible a cooperative approach to the needs and problems of the peoples of the world.

Opportunity for review of the charter is provided, just as our own Constitution is subject to scrutiny in the light of changing conditions. If such review, carefully conducted and with our own constitutional provisions and procedures in mind, indicates a need for revision by orderly process, then we should be ready to play our part in such endeavors for the good of ourselves and mankind as a whole. Just as we have used our own Constitution as a guide to our national strength

and mutual cooperation between States without sacrifice of individual rights so the United Nations Charter can, properly used, become the means to a comparable worldwide cooperative approach to world peace.

LIBERALIZE MEMBERSHIP PROVISIONS

It is evident that the membership provisions of the charter should be liberalized to permit membership by a larger number of smaller nations who can contribute much to the success of the work of the United Nations. I believe that means should be found to bring into focus the contributions to mutual security and cooperative effort which an increased membership would make possible. The method by which this can be accomplished must be left to those in a position to understand all the implications of the present limitations and the effects of liberalization of policy. However, it must be recognized that participation by more nations within the principles and objectives of that charter should not be prevented by yielding to the pressures of those who would reduce to impotency the leadership of the United States and the effectiveness of the United Nations.

Again, I want to emphasize, in conclusion, my belief that, just as the Constitution of the United States has assured this vast country a working plan for mutual assistance with a degree of local sovereignty for its component parts, so can the United Nations, with its charter provisions, appropriately modified in the light of experience, be the bulwark of world peace within the loss of any sovereignty which properly is and should be ours as a nation.

I believe that the United Nations is the one last hope for future security from the ravages of war. To this end I urge you distinguished gentlemen, personally and on behalf of those of my colleagues who share these views, to lend your talents and leadership to the maintenance and strengthening of the United Nations and its auxiliary agencies and services. To me this is essential to our own and the world's welfare.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Dr. Nelson.

Mr. Philip Frieder.

Mr. Frieder, we are glad to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP FRIEDER, YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF DENVER, COLO.

Mr. FRIEDER. Thank you, sir. My name is Philip Frieder. My address is 75 South Forest Street, Denver.

I am here as a representative of the Young Democrats of Denver, an organization of over 750 members. Over 200 members were present at our last meeting, at which time the statement I shall read was unanimously approved.

We were also pleased to have at our meeting Congressman Byron Rogers.

The Young Democrats of Denver welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the United Nations to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter.

Our approach to revision of the U. N. Charter may best be gaged by outlining our attitude toward the U. N. itself.

PURPOSES OF THE U. N. ENDORSED

The U. N. concept embraces two basic principles which reflect the universal yearning for peace. First is the objective of promoting collective thought and effort to achieve collective security—security in its broadest sense rather than in a limited military meaning. Second is related objective of seeking to eliminate the underlying cause of war. Our organization subscribes wholeheartedly to these fundamental purposes of the U. N.

That the U. N. has neither achieved collective security nor eradicated the underlying causes of world tensions is evident enough. But it must always be remembered that the machinery of the U. N. was not designed to preserve and promote peace among the major powers. The U. N. Charter entrusted to the major powers the responsibility for preserving peace among the less powerful nations. Since present world tensions arise out of disagreement among the major powers, the U. N. has seldom had the opportunity to function in the kind of peaceful postwar climate envisaged in 1945.

Yet it would be less than objective to emphasize shortcomings of the U. N. in the political arena while overlooking the encouraging degree of success of many of the specialized agencies of the U. N. in solving economic and social problems. We have the evidence that nations of varying size, culture, and influence can learn to work together to overcome common problems. And lurking always in the background is the melancholy realization that were there no U. N. organization today, we would be struggling desperately to create one.

NO DRASTIC REVISIONS

We believe that any attempt to weaken the present role of the U. N., on the one hand, or to transform the U. N. into a superstate, on the other hand, would be unfortunate. Charter revision should reflect those evolutions in U. N. institutions and procedures which have been accepted or are widely recognized as desirable. And above all, any revision should have as its guiding purpose the enhancement of the U. N. as a world organization for the promotion of peace and security.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Frieder.

We had two other names on our list, but both of them have submitted their statements, and they will become a part of the record, along with two others that have been inserted, without objection:

Elizabeth Gatewood Pietsch, of Denver, appearing for herself; and Mr. W. V. Kennett, of Elizabeth, Colo., appearing for himself.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH GATEWOOD PIETSCH, A CHARTER MEMBER OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS OF DENVER, COLO.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: As a mother and a scientist as well as a federalist since 1942, I am deeply concerned about the present state of the world, but the increasing attempts of the Senate and of you as its representative, to solve some of the most crucial problems gives all of us, I believe, cause for real hope.

You are fully familiar with Grenville Clark's carefully thoughtout plan for an enforceable disarmament, so I will only ask you to give it very serious consideration in making your final recommendations. The big lack in the United States disarmament proposals so far presented, and perhaps it has been necessary up until now, has been in plans for enforcement. As I see it, that is why we need charter review and revision. Any agreed-on disarmament plan must be under enforceable controls. The force of law in this field, agreed to by all nations, is the basic necessity. The power of enforcement has to be somewhere, the United Nations seems the logical place to put it, and this country would do well to urge charter revision for that purpose.

In other matters of international concern, it seems to me that more cooperation is what we should continue to strive for, rather than legislation. Charter changes in those fields do not seem to me to be urgent or even necessary at this time.

There is one thing we could be doing now that might improve the chances for agreement on disarmament. It would at least slow down the speed of the arms race, if successful, and give us more time to reach a safe agreement. It is to try in the U. N. for a universal ban on atomic testing. Until we know more about the long-range effects of radioactive rays and fallout, we may be defeating our own purposes otherwise. Controls could be maintained without violating any country's borders, so agreement on a ban should not be too difficult. I hope you will agree that this is a first step worth trying for now and that you will back up our atomic scientists in urging it.

PROPOSAL FOR THE REVISION OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS, PRESENTED
BY W. V. KENNETH, ELIZABETH, COLO.

In his book War or Peace, published in 1950, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles commented as follows:

"I have never seen any proposal made for collective security with 'teeth' in it, or for 'world government' or for 'world federation' which could not be carried out either by the United Nations or under the United Nations Charter."

The United Nations Charter was designed to tackle the problem of collective security on a worldwide basis. Now we think of it as providing security by groups of nations within the United Nations forming unions to present a stronger military front.

Jesus said, "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

The truth is plain for all to read.

The peoples of the world have refused to follow the commandment of God to love one another. The bloodstream has become infected with lethal qualities that must be purged because of this disobedience.

Man must live before he can be of any value to his neighbor, his God, or himself. Physical health thus becomes his first concern. From this springs the need for food, clothing, and housing as the basic needs for universal physical health.

Man cannot be sure of perpetuating himself upon earth until he is sane. We have education, indoctrination, religion, and medicine to insure his mental health.

Spiritual health is necessary to give direction to the activities of man.

Religion also lends a yardstick by which man measures his sanity and charts the direction of his course.

Organized warfare make military objectives ends within themselves and ignores the physical, mental, and spiritual necessities of man. Armed might as a preventative of war can be toppled from its throne by the very fear it engenders.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that organized warfare is destructive, to all phases of health, physical, mental, and spiritual.

See the difficulty of a hungry or crippled child in a world of plenty trying to get a concept of a loving, kindly God. Christians allow God's Kingdom to be destroyed by military beliefs. Spiritual health thus has become of secondary consideration.

The peoples of the world are sovereign. They must be given the right to protect the health of the world by maintaining peace by force.

The United Nations has the organization and procedures necessary for supplanting the charter with a constitution for the world.

This constitution should provide for the surrender by all member nations of their authority to make war one with another.

The constitution should provide for the establishment of judicial, legislative, and executive bodies with provisions for financing, perpetuating, and protecting these groups.

The idea that if we can be restrained from killing one another in war, we can eventually make laws which will adequately protect the physical, mental, and spiritual health of the individual world citizen must be the incentive to establish under the world constitution a career world police force to maintain the peace by force.

The keeping of the peace by force is the necessity of the world today and nothing should be allowed to befog the issue. Once the people of the world are protected by a police force then we in each nation can struggle with ideologies, with cultures, with communications of space, and other new concepts of existence. Peace maintained by an international police force will not destroy the world but will foster world health for the individual world citizen.

Mr. Dulles has had his opportunity to make peace proposals work in the United Nations under the charter. Sovereignty has always appeared more glamorous to governments than world health to the individual. Let us return to the rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness for each person in the world and trade our national sovereignty for a world police force under God.

Senator SPARKMAN. The other two witnesses were Miss Lois R. Eagan, of Denver, appearing for herself and Mrs. Franklyn Brown, of Colorado Springs, appearing for herself.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

FORWARD NOW! (INC.),
Denver, Colo.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN,

*Congressional Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter,
Washington, D. C.*

SIRS: *Resolved*, That, via amendment to the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations as a body is resolved to encourage and foster the creation and use of money issued free of tribute at the source.

What does this mean? It means that all the world is in a state of vague unrest, knowing that there was a time when America found something good for hungry stomachs and poor housing, and that this something good was connected with the money system, but cannot be discovered today. It means that herein, via amendment, the United Nations may assist in that discovery, again, for the people at large.

This something good was marvelous, and deserved its world praise. It was really a gimmick, though the early Americans called it economic freedom, and linked it with political and religious freedom to forge ahead miraculously into well-being and abundance, though all the rest of the world was mired deep in poverty, debt, and taxes. And we of Forward Now hold that this amendment to the United Nations Charter may provide stimulus in bringing back those happy ways of world peace, and brotherhood without the necessity of using force or a police force. Simply stated, free-of-tribute money means that all money shall be issued free by the local government concerned for the good of all.

Certainly this system, based on the highest tenets of economic law, has been given a definite trial run or test run and passed with the highest honors, including acclaim by the then known world.

Frequently one hears of long-forgotten bank accounts, and one wonders how people could be so careless. But consider America, which had this wonder gimmick in use for over a century with the grandest of success (for her people developed full employment, full production, full purchasing power, and no poor-houses and no need of them), and today, after winning the full right of use (in 1776), she allows that priceless treasure and legacy to lie unclaimed in the Constitution: Article I, section 8, paragraph 5, while she experiments around with outmoded economic schemes that have brought only disaster to every nation that ever had to depend on them.

The Americans practiced full monetization of the worker's wages free, with the local government in charge, which is a feat no nation on earth can claim today. The success of their system proved that peace and prosperity are achievable goals when the governing powers act for the good of all (common welfare).

Moreover, any nation can follow their simple rules and good example; and, other things being equal, the greater the population, the greater can be their wealth and resultant monetized earnings, if no handicap is hung around their necks in the form of money tribute.

All the nations of the world are desperately in need of just such a positive, golden-rule-in-practice system; conditions are almost back where the colonists started, with war-torn, suspicious, defense-budgeted-to-death nations, all jittery.

And no nation needs encouragement more than America. She cannot lead the world, for she has troubles: surpluses—amid hungry families and many on relief—in fact, 18 percent of her people constantly on relief; housing shortages that constitute a national scandal; unemployment and strikes, such as the impending struggle between the titans of labor and the only overlords they can see (they cannot see the tyranny of improper money), not to mention lack of schools and roads or a fair shake for the ever-patient farmers.

The world's need of this amendment, in practice, is great; America's need of it is great—probably it will become a race to see which will forge to the front as world leader in the cause of humanitarianism—America or a reformed United Nations.

And when it comes to reformation, America should start the ball rolling, as she is the only nation in the world with the written right to free money. Why should she continue short of cash, her pockets sewed up, when individuals are short of money; business must borrow to pay wages; communities are in debt; the State governments cannot make ends meet; and the National Government must borrow money from the tributeers at great usurious charges, which constitute national debt and deficit financing. Yet how many of you noted in your local papers the report of the so-called Federal Reserve (no share of stock owned by the Federal Government) to the effect that its member banks cleared a profit of over a billion dollars after taxes for the year 1954, from the American public?

Congress voted the tributeers in, and Congress can vote them out. And if the national legislative bodies are too filled with inertia to make a start, the local governments can exercise some of their own rights to safeguard the welfare of the Nation and the common welfare. This latter might prove a salubrious experience for America and an example for the nations, as the exercise of local government functions leads us to enjoy the happy jingle of coins in our pockets without increased taxation and without borrowing from the National Government, simply through the proper monetization of the production, services, and need of that community.

It can be done. It has been done before. If the United Nations wishes to become known as a leader, it should slowly but surely rid itself of all tribute-boobytraps and come out forthrightly in favor of any and all nations seeking freedom from tribute.

Is this easy to do? God help us, no. For every nation boasting of a "national" bank and most international organizations are based on or honeycombed with termite-tribute. War depends upon the tributeers almost exclusively, as the following two-sentence summary reveals:

First, today, the wealth of the people, whether in America or Timbuctoo, must be spent to purchase money, whereas in the uniquely successful American experience, wealth was spent to purchase goods, which were constantly used up, thus providing full employment, production, buying power, high-living standards, etc. But (secondly), today, in purchasing money (formerly distributed free), the people have no wealth left to purchase goods off the shelves; hence a war is necessary to shoot them away, thus providing make-shift work for employees, who reload the shelves—to the tune of great national debt, depressions, panics, wars, etc., unto unborn generations.

Without tribute money, war is a lost cause; the cause of war being removed, busy, steady, satisfactorily independent nations can become a working force for law and order. Is this too great a goal for the U. N.?

And though the big-banking fraternity now seems determined to make a last great subservient "colonial empire" out of the common welfare of all the people, yet when enlightened public opinion gets to work, miracles of change will be in order. For one, decentralization will set in—with a possible result that little bankers will realize more from actual (and honest) handling of real cash money than they ever did from credit inflation.

Another will be a change from the weary citizens' "Let's float a bond issue and more taxes" to the solvent citizens' "Let's pay cash—my wages have been upped to cover the social benefits of scientific advances and invention."

Municipalities, districts, and even nations are fast learning how to monetize the workers' wages—thus giving money to the public instead of taking it away. Alberta, Canada, is fighting valiantly for a change in the national tribute-blighted charter; Albertans would have a written money right such as the Americans choose to neglect. Brazil is said to have solved a housing shortage in recent years—with American-style money. Sweden combines some government with some tribute to achieve some liberty—and her success shows that even a start in the right direction produces results. England—always a stronghold of tribute and frequently a stranglehold on the currency-and-credit of the nation—resorts surreptitiously to tribute-free money when the garroting influence of her gold-money crowd becomes too severe.

These factors make for freedom of the money supply—and, therefore, for system and economic law and peace. When whole nations learn how proper money in the hands of the Common Joe can remove the blight of war and speed the coming of peace, they will no longer feel the need to resort to rapaciousness.

Who knows? They may, in time, even begin to turn their talents to peacetime progress and such feats as the discovery of ameliorating world weather procedures—a social act of kindness which tribute money could never afford, for it thrives on financial stringency.

The truth about economic law cannot be forever suppressed and kept under wraps. Sooner or later, it will become available to all and the sanctioned practice of all nations, in both their domestic and international relationships. May the happy day come soon.

So * * * call it the Golden Rule; call it early Americanism; call it the satisfying, positive "economic creed" that the workers of the world have long demanded, but, United Nations and/or America—get it.

All the world hungers for it: it is food, drink, shelter, peace, happiness. It is the answer for you, for me, for "purchasing-power-and-now-guaranteed-annual-wage Reuther"—and for all mankind.

If moral support is the goal of the United Nations, let them take hold and take heed and incorporate money without tribute in their charter. So we say:

Resolved, That, via amendment to the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations as a body is resolved to foster and encourage the creation and use of money issued free of tribute at the source, as a working factor toward world peace.

(Miss) LOIS R. EAGAN,
Chairman, Forward Now! (Inc.)

STATEMENT OF MRS. FRANKLYN BROWN, SPEAKING AS AN INDIVIDUAL, ON REVIEW OF THE U. N. CHARTER

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Mrs. Franklyn Brown, of Colorado Springs, speaking as an individual.

THE U. N.'S PRIMARY FUNCTION

The primary function of the United Nations should be to serve as a worldwide diplomatic meeting place for the discussion of the maintenance of international peace and security.

EFFECT OF ENDOWING THE U. N. WITH POWER TO INTERVENE IN THE PURELY DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF ITS MEMBERS

Therefore, I should like to speak on article E, page 7, which deals with the effect of endowing the U. N. with power to intervene in the purely domestic affairs of its members.

To put it bluntly, the American people do not want the U. N. to have authority in our local and purely domestic affairs. If the U. N. assumes domestic power, it will be impossible for the American people to support it. Other nations appear to share that view. For example, the Human Rights Declaration recently adopted at the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas contains a provision recognizing:

"The inalienable right of each American state to * * * attain economic independence and live its own cultural and social life without intervention on the part of any state or group of states, directly or indirectly, in their internal and external affairs. * * *"

U. N. meddling in domestic affairs creates friction and irritation among nations. It does not promote peace. Consider, for example, the U. N. resolutions

that seek to tell South Africa how she is to treat her own citizens of Indian extraction. Would it not be better for Mr. Nehru to improve the lot of his untouchables at home rather than having a platform in the U. N. from which to promote discord. Indians in South Africa are treated no worse than millions of Indians in their native land. No doubt there is great injustice in the world and even in the United States there is room for improvement in the treatment of minorities. It does not help, however, either the victims of injustice or the peace of the world to have the U. N. meddling in domestic affairs.

AMENDMENT OF THE DOMESTIC JURISDICTION CLAUSE—ARTICLE 2, PARAGRAPH 7

Article 2, paragraph 7, provides in part: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the U. N. to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state * * *"

Without the assurance of that protection, the U. N. Charter would not have been ratified by the Senate. When the charter was under consideration article 2, paragraph 7 was used to allay all fears that the U. N. might assume some control over the purely domestic affairs of the United States and its citizens. We have not received the protection that article 2, paragraph 7 was intended to provide.

In 1950, the Department of State stripped article 2, paragraph 7 of all meaning when it announced in an official publication that "There is no longer any difference between foreign and domestic affairs." In addition, former Secretary of State Acheson in a speech made on September 18, 1952, boldly declared that the nations in joining the U. N. subjected themselves "to what amounts to an international legislative system" that "was to deal with the individual and the rights of the individual." (Department of State bulletin, October 6, 1952, p. 530.)

Later, U. N. officials extended that theory in saying that:

"Once a matter has become, in one way or another, the subject or regulation by the U. N., be it by resolution of the General Assembly or by convention between member states at the instance of the U. N., that subject ceases to be a matter being 'essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states.'" (Moses Moskowitz, 35 A. B. A. J., pp. 283-285.)

The Humphrey-Moskowitz theory has come to represent the official view of the U. N. It is endorsed by numerous deans and professors of law schools who, as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee knows, oppose the Bricker amendment. While the Bricker amendment was under discussion, the U. N.'s treaty-making ambitions were soft-pedaled for obvious reasons. However, the schemes to give the U. N. control over almost every phase of human existence have not been abandoned. We need the Bricker amendment to erect a constitutional and a congressional fence between the ambitions of the global bureaucrats and the inalienable rights of the American people. Unless that protection is provided, the United States will eventually withdraw from the U. N.

As additional protection, article 2, paragraph 7 should be amended to make it clear that the U. N. and its specialized agencies have no authority to draft international agreements dealing with subjects that are primarily the concern and responsibility of U. N. member nations and their political subdivisions.

Senator SPARKMAN. I want to thank all of those who have helped in holding these hearings. I want to thank the witnesses who have presented their views in a very fine manner, and I want to express our appreciation to the audience for your patience, your courtesy, and your kindnesses.

The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 10:15 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

The following letter was subsequently received for insertion in the record:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Denver, Colo., April 29, 1955.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the hearings of your subcommittee in Denver recently, you invited persons to submit written statements concerning the relationship of the United States to the United Nations. As I listened to the testimony being

offered, I felt impelled to make this statement, in an effort to go back to first principles.

There was much discussion of the question of universality of membership in the United Nations, but few who suggested it gave any clear, logical defense of that position. Many clearly view the United Nations as being of value only to the extent that it serves the announced purposes of the Government of the United States. Clearly, we need to do some hard thinking on this basic question.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence, which is our basic testament of faith, had a clear view of sovereignty, for they were living under a tyrannical King, who asserted a doctrine of absolute sovereignty resting in the King. They declared, for all the world to hear, the revolutionary doctrine that all sovereignty rests in the people, and that governments are instituted among men to secure certain rights, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that the people have the right to alter or abolish any form of government that becomes destructive of these ends.

On this fundamental principle they later built a Constitution of limited powers, delegating certain of our inalienable sovereign powers into the hands of the Federal Government; and in constitutions for each of the several States, the citizens thereof further delegated certain powers to such State governments. In our charter cities, the citizens have further established by charter, governments of limited powers for the mutual benefit of the inhabitants of such cities. But in every case, the citizens retained the ultimate power of the sovereign to alter or abolish those forms, in accordance with amendment X of the United States Constitution. The position of the Founding Fathers with respect to sovereignty was summarized very simply in the very preamble of that Constitution which provides: "We, the people of the United States, * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Unhappily, over the years a corrosion of this clear view has taken place, and the seeds for it are found in the very Declaration of Independence, which provides in its closing paragraph the claim: "We * * * solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States; * * * and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, * * * and do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do." This may be the early justification for the doctrine of the absolute sovereign state, which has in our day largely replaced the doctrine of the absolute sovereign monarch. Certainly there has been a growing acceptance of some such doctrine in recent years.

In cases stretching at least back to *Fong Yuc Ting v. U. S.* (149 U. S. 698, in 1893) the courts have granted a concept of absolute national sovereignty with respect to international affairs, that perhaps reached a high point in the decision delivered by Mr. Justice Sutherland in *U. S. v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (299 U. S. 304, in 1936) when he said:

"It will contribute to the elucidation of the question if we first consider the differences between the powers of the Federal Government in respect to foreign or external affairs and those in respect of domestic or internal affairs. That there are differences between them, and that these differences are fundamental, may not be doubted.

"The two classes of powers are different, both in respect of their origin and their nature. The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States. * * * That this doctrine applies only to powers which the States had, is self-evident. And since the States severally never possessed international powers, such powers could not have been carved from the mass of State powers but obviously were transmitted to the United States from some other source * * *.

"It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as

necessary concomitants of nationality. * * * As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. Otherwise, the United States is not completely sovereign. [Cases cited.] In each of the cases cited the Court found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution but in the law of nations * * *."

The authority of the line of cases, and of congressional action, may have been necessary in the time of international anarchy in which our Nation was born, and in which it has lived most of its life. But instead of abandoning our original fundamental principle, as this case does, we ought rather to restate our hope that the principle of individual sovereignty will one day find worldwide expression.

To be specific, if each of us is a sovereign only over himself, and if we achieve any form of government only by pooling some of our sovereign powers into such an organization for our mutual benefit, as I hold is the essence of the American political revolution in world history, then the statements by Justice Sutherland, for example, are a betrayal of our fundamental principles—for they are a powerful and authoritative statement that implies that I, and my fellowcitizens, are simply subjects of an entity that in and of itself is "completely sovereign."

More than that, even though we cannot yet fully implement our basic principle in world affairs, it seems to me that we should at all times consistently uphold the principle of personal sovereignty—that just governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed—by recognizing that the day of anarchy in international affairs must be brought to an end as quickly as possible.

For if our principle is good and just, it is a general principle, which extends across national boundaries. Other persons in other lands are sovereign, too; and if I would operate in an orderly relationship to them, under a framework of law capable of achieving justice, I would seek to have them join me in pooling our separate and individual (not national) sovereignty into a United Nations, of limited power. Let us grant that this goal lies a bit further on, in history, than today—but the goal will only be achieved as we clearly recognize it and strive for it, thus reaffirming our faith in the equality of all men and in the inalienability of their rights to establish and alter their governments.

The best definition of democracy that I have heard comes from a theologian, Prof. Dan Williams, of Union Theological Seminary (and a fellow Denverite), who defines it thus: "Democracy consists of the right of every person to participate effectively in making the decisions which affect himself." Surely this is the goal of the democratic revolution, which we did so much to advance in the world these past two centuries. Surely the gradual improvement of our realization of this ideal has been the brightness of our historical advancement during these past two centuries. Surely every freeman seeks to strengthen this right, and every man who is not free seeks it. Surely, then, we do ourselves and our history a disservice when we appear to demand this right only for ourselves, and not equally for all men, everywhere.

Examine, by contrast, the history of those nations that have loudly proclaimed the doctrine of unlimited national sovereignty, during the years of our own history. Napoleon, the Kaiser, the Czars, Mussolini, Hitler, and with them one might be tempted to place Lenin, Stalin, and others—all have defended the absolutely sovereign rights of the state which they led to make decisions vitally affecting the lives of others, without consideration for those others. How shall we, then, join in any chorus loudly affirming any doctrine of unlimited national sovereignty? For it is the genius of this people that they broke the back of an arrogant absolute monarch, and established a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The principles upon which we have built are good, they are firm foundations, they have a universal appeal, and they must not be betrayed by us, no matter how frenzied the clamor for granting unlimited powers to a national government—not no matter how often the other powerful nations tempt us to match them in a race to death in defense of one form of nation-state over another.

Let us rather offer to generalize our principle, to share it with the world not simply as an ideal, but as a practical reality. Let us begin again to move forward in capturing the imagination and zeal of peoples everywhere by recognizing that the righteous and rightful exercise of our own power in international relationships must arise out of a sharing of individual sovereignty across the frontiers. By so doing, international decisions can be democratized, so that every person may participate effectively in making the decisions that affect himself—a thing he surely cannot do if he is merely a subject of an unlimited national government which is the ultimate repository of sovereignty powers.

Then let us choose between these rival concepts of sovereignty, choosing that which can save the world from anarchy and resulting chaos, choosing that which is consistent with the greatness of our own history. Let us share the sovereignty which each of us possesses with our neighbors everywhere, through a further revision of the United Nations.

Obviously we can only do this by making of the United Nations a universal organization. More than that, the ultimate goal will require that the United Nations representatives be elected by the peoples of each nation, rather than be appointed by the administrations in control of those areas. But just as our own Senate was democratized only over a long period of time, and much agitation on the part of the people for a popular election, so also popular election of delegates to the UN can only be provided on a permissive basis in any charter revision, with each national group having to decide for itself how rapidly to democratize. For we did not achieve our present degree of democracy in one fell swoop, but only as a series of little steps forward. So also, we should seek to have the United Nations take such little steps forward, but take them on a basis that builds soundly for the future. This is our mission, and this is our task.

Very truly yours,

BYRON L. JOHNSON,
Representative From Arapahoe County.

X